



TITLE:

A new study of the Kubyaukgyi (Myazedi) inscription

AUTHOR(S):

Miyake, Marc

CITATION:

Miyake, Marc. A new study of the Kubyaukgyi (Myazedi) inscription. Proceedings of the 51st International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics 2018: 44.

ISSUE DATE:

2018-09

URL:

<http://hdl.handle.net/2433/235297>

RIGHT:

A new study of the Kubyaukgyi (Myazedi) inscription

Marc Miyake

September 10, 2018

This paper is a new analysis of the 'Rosetta Stone' for the decipherment of the extinct Pyu language once spoken in what is now Upper Burma. The two pillars collectively known as the Kubyaukgyi (a.k.a. Myazedi) inscription from c. 1112 CE have two copies of the same text in four languages: Old Burmese, Old Mon, Pali, and Pyu. I present a critical edition of the text based on newly taken photographs using RTI (Reflectance Transformation Imaging) technology. I provide English glosses and translations of all versions of the text. I also include notes on the phonology and syntax of the Pyu text and a glossary of all words in the Pyu text including their equivalents in the other three languages of the inscription.

Unlike previous Western scholarship on the Kubyaukgyi, this paper incorporates the findings of earlier Japanese studies of the Kubyaukgyi inscription. It also takes into account recent developments in Mon and Pyu language studies.

1 Introduction: previous studies of the Kubyakugyi inscription

The extinct Trans-Himalayan (a.k.a. Sino-Tibetan) language Pyu was spoken in what is now Upper Burma during the first millennium and early second millennium CE. For an overview of current knowledge about Pyu civilization, see Stargardt [1990] and Arlo Griffiths and Wheatley [2017].

The Pyu language is known only from written sources of two types: inscriptional texts in the Pyu script and a limited number of transcriptions in Middle Chinese. The corpus of inscriptions is available online at Griffiths et al. [2018]. Arlo Griffiths and Wheatley [2017] provides an inventory of the former and provides a few examples of the latter; a detailed examination of the Chinese material is forthcoming.

The most studied and most famous of all Pyu texts is the ဂူပြောက်ကြီး Kubyaukgyi inscription (hereafter simply "Kubyaukgyi"), also known as the မြေစေတီ Myazedi 'Emerald Pagoda' or ရာဇကုမာရ် Yazakumar inscription. The first two names refer to where the inscription was found; the third name to the prince mentioned in it. The "inscription" actually consists of a total of eight inscriptions: four on each side of two pillars conventionally known as A and B. The text on the two pillars is nearly identical. The text on each side of each pillar is in a different language: Old Burmese (OB), Pali, Old Mon (OM), and Pyu.

The two pillars were found in မြင်းကပါ Myinkaba south of Pagan by Dr. Emil Forchhammer in 1886-87. The smaller A pillar was near the Myazedi pagoda which was built in modern times; it has now been relocated to the Pagan Museum. The larger B pillar was in four pieces: two by the Myazedi pagoda and two at the neighboring Kubyaukgyi temple. These pieces have been reassembled into a single restored pillar now standing on the grounds of the Myazedi pagoda. Bits of the B pillar are missing, so its texts are incomplete; nonetheless, "what remains [is], however, beautifully clear" Duroiselle [1919a].

The top parts of the OB and Pali text were partly transliterated in Forchhammer [1892] on the basis of rubbings made before the bottom piece of the B pillar was fully excavated. That first OB transliteration was marred by modernized spellings. Tun Nyein was the first to translate the OB text into English in Nyein [1899]; a first translation of the Pali translation into French was published a few years later in Beylié [1907].

The OM text was unexamined until Blagden [1909] which was the first decipherment of any text in OM. In addition to transliterating and translating the A version of the OM text into English with extensive line-by-line commentary, Blagden also included the first complete transliteration of the Burmese text and a transliteration of the Pali lines missing from Forchhammer [1892]. Blagden [1910a] provided corrigenda for the OB readings of this pioneering effort and a reading of the B version of the OM text.

Those two articles were then followed by Blagden [1911] on both versions of the Pyu text. Blagden's third article is the foundation of Pyu linguistics; no one had ever studied the Pyu language before, and all other work on the Pyu section of the Kubyaukgyi has been heavily indebted to Blagden's second breakthrough in Southeast Asian decipherment. Prior to Blagden, what he referred to as "the fourth text of the Myazedi inscriptions" had "variously been conjectured to be in some old form either of Assamese, Tibetan, Cambodian, or Shan."

Instead of taking a top-down approach with an *a priori* hypothesis about the language of the text, Blagden adopted an agnostic bottom-up approach "to study the text itself, in both copies, compare it with the parallel versions [in other languages] and endeavour to analyse it as far as possible." He began by matching names and Indic loanwords in the various versions to identify the characters of the mystery script, and proceeded to read and gloss other words on the basis of his interpretation of the script and of the other texts. He made no attempt to be comprehensive by claiming he understood every word of the mystery language. Instead he built solid cases for twenty-six words, noting that some of them were similar to OB and, in one, case, OM. He concluded that

we have before us a specimen of a language of Burma, not some distant and foreign tongue. Moreover, the language must have been in some kind of contact with Talaing [i.e., OM]: the Talaing loanword and the peculiar letter *h* necessitate that inference. [...] I think the language of our text may with much probability be ascribed to the neighborhood of Prome, and it is not an extravagant conjecture to suggest that it may have been the language of the Pyu (or Pru) tribe which is said to have inhabited that region at an earlier period. [...] What is quite certain is that the language of our text (though assuredly not a mere dialect of Burmese) is either a Tibeto-Burman one or has been deeply modified by some member of the Tibeto-Burman family. (pp. 381-382)

All subsequent scholars have adopted Blagden's identification of the language as Tibeto-Burman and his use of the term Pyu for it (albeit with reservations in some cases).

Blagden's first paper on Pyu ended with a transliteration of the Pyu text of column A supplemented with variants from column B with English translations interspersed. Throughout this paper

and all his works, Blagden maintained a rare degree of honesty about his limitations; at the very end and in Blagden [1912] he printed yet more corrigenda for his 1909 and 1910 papers on the other texts of the Kubyaukgyi inscription.

Cœdès [1911] hailed blagden1911 as "sur ce texte qui était resté jusqu'ici rebelle à tout essai d'interprétation [...] un déchiffrement complet et très satisfaisant", His only quibble concerned Blagden's interpretation of the date in the Pyu text; he proposed that the Pyu used akṣaras as numeral symbols.

Blagden [1914] was a defense of a "much more literal" interpretation of OB spelling as "practically phonetic". Although scholars now take transliterations of OB for granted, in Blagden's day even a noted Orientalist such as his critic R. F. St. Andrew St. John could fall into the trap of anachronistically projecting modern Burmese pronunciation onto OB spellings: e.g., rejecting the evidence for a medial /l/ no longer present in modern Burmese.

The most extensive single work on the Kubyaukgyi inscription is the first part of the first volume of *Epigraphia Birmanica* which covered all four sides of both pillars. An article was devoted to each language of the inscription. Each article contained transcriptions and side-by-side photographs of both the A and B versions of each text followed by a new English translation.

Duroiselle [1919a] took up more than sixty percent of that issue; it contained extensive notes on its Burmese transliteration system and on individual words from a comparative perspective. Although Duroiselle justified OB medial /l/ at length, he oddly excluded it from his section on transliteration. His "Index of Burmese words explained" was unfortunately not accompanied by a comprehensive glossary like those of the Mon and Pyu articles in that issue.

Duroiselle used the inscription "to rectify the chronological errors of the Burmese chronicle *Mahāyāzawin* မဟာရာဇဝင် and Sir Arthur Phayre in respect of four of the most important reigns of that period of Burmese history." The Pali inscription states that Kyanzittha's reign began 1,628 years after the *parinibbāna* of the Buddha and that he died 28 years later. Adding those figures to 544 BCE, the traditional Burmese date for that event, Duroiselle calculated that Kyanzittha became king in 1084 CE and died in 1112 CE.

Although the inscription has often been assigned the date 1112 CE, none of its faces mention when it was written, and neither Duroiselle nor Blagden dated it.

Blagden [1910b] "hesitate[d] to put a date" to the Kubyaukgyi inscription, though he did not agree with Fleet, who thought the inscription "is not a synchronous one; that is, that it was framed and engraved, not when the acts registered by it were performed, but a considerable time afterwards" (Blagden and Fleet [1910]).

Blagden [1910b] hypothesized that

a recent expansion of Burmese rule had brought neighbouring alien races under its sway, and that the prince who performed the act of piety recorded in these inscriptions was anxious that it should be commemorated in a manner which would be understood by all the more important sections of the population comprised in the Burmese empire. But would anyone, after a lapse of many years, have thought it worth his while to draft and set up in four different languages a statement of the fact that a long deceased prince had made a votive offering on behalf of a long deceased king? I do not think so: surely the principle of *cui bono* applies strongly to such a case of this.

He concluded that the Kubyaukgyi inscription "must be dated somewhere about the time of Kyanzittha's death" without providing a precise year.

Duroiselle [1919b], the section on the Pali text, was far briefer than the section on the OB text that preceded it. It did not even have a title; all it had beyond the bare bones of transcriptions, photographs, and an annotated translation was the text reorganized in metrical form.

The remaining two sections of *Epigraphia Birmanica* were Blagden's refinements of his earlier work on the OM and Pyu texts of the Kubyaukgyi. Both Blagden [1919a] and Blagden [1919b] contained lexicons of all OM and Pyu words other than names in those texts. His OM lexicon had only one error; he interpreted what is now read as a single word *rampo* 'portion' (Jenny/McCormick); as two words, *ram* 'to help' and *po* 'for'. Although *ram* is an actual Old Mon word, *po* 'is not'.

Blagden [1919b] was to be Blagden's swan song on Pyu:

So far as appears at present, the prospects of Pyu epigraphy are not very promising, and unless much additional material is discovered in the future, it does not seem likely that any great progress will ever be made in the study of this obsolete language.

Although Blagden moved on to other OM texts beginning with part 2 of *Epigraphia Birmanica*, he never touched Pyu again.

There was a quarter-century void in Kubyaukgyi studies that ended with Shafer [1943] which built upon Blagden's work on the Pyu faces of the Kubyaukgyi and other Pyu texts (reprinted in Blagden [1917]), and Blagden's reading of PYU001 quoted in

Shafer's article had ten sections. Three overlapped with what Blagden had already published: (1) epigraphy, (8) a transcription with the first word-for-word translation as well as a more natural translation, and (9) a Pyu-English vocabulary. Beckwith [2002] reprinted entries for non-Indic, non-Mon words with certain meanings from Shafer's vocabulary with minor changes and the suggestion that Pyu *am* "represents a vowel different from [a]" which "was perhaps closer to [e]". The other sections of Shafer's article examined the Pyu text from a linguistic perspective for the first time.

(2) compared Pyu grammatical words with the corresponding words in OB, OM, and Pali.

(3) was a survey of the Indic loans in all three non-Pali texts of the Kubyaukgyi and the Pyu urn. Shafer concluded that there were three strata of Indic loans in Pyu, an older and a newer layer preserving final *a* and a third layer without stem-final *a* via OB or OM. He drew a line between what he called Old Pyu and New Pyu on the basis of the different strata of Indic loans and grammatical differences between the Kubyaukgyi and the older urn texts described in (7).

(4) provided eight sets of sound correspondences between Pyu and other Trans-Himalayan languages: primarily Written Burmese, "Old Bodish" (i.e., Classical Tibetan, not Old Tibetan), and "Lucei" (i.e., Lushai, a.k.a. Mizo).

(5) was a brief discussion of prefixes with a focus on numerals.

(6) was a slightly less brief comparison of Pyu and Karenic vocabulary.

(7) was a survey of Pyu grammar with notes on parts of speech and a list of differences between Kubyaukgyi and pre-Kubyaukgyi Pyu.

(10) was a summary of the above including a list of Indic-to-Pyu sound conversion laws.

The Kubyaukgyi caught the interest of scholars again a decade after the Second World War.

Nishida [1955] contained tables of the OB characters and rhymes and a list of OB consonant clusters attested in the Kubyaukgyi and an annotated word-for-word translation of the OB text into Japanese. Nishida [1956] presented sound correspondences between the rhymes of the OB

of Kubyaukgyi and those of Proto-Tibeto-Burman and Written Burmese with references to Written Tibetan and modern Burmese dialects. Nishida then provided an inventory of OB phonemes including retroflex consonants (!) based on his analysis and a classification of OB suffixes.

Both Tun [1958] and Tha Myat [1958] provided Burmese transliterations of the Pyu text and English translations of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi. Than Tun also gave a word-for-word English translation whereas Tha Myat wrote the first Pyu-Burmese glossary of words in the text. Tha Myat [1958] was reprinted as part of Tha Myat [1963] without the glossary.

Luce [1961] \commentmarc{which I haven't seen} contained a transliteration and English translation of the Mon text of the Kubyaukgyi; Bauer [1990] drew upon it as a source of data for the Old Mon prefix *s-*.

Luce and Shin [1969-1970] placed the Kubyaukgyi into historical context, explaining why it has the four languages that it does and why Kyanzittha, a Burmese king, wrote so much in Mon rather than his native language:

For the 11th century, we have to imagine the present proportion of Burmese and Mons reversed: a small minority of conquering Burmans, large numbers of native Mons; among the Burmans, only a few literates, mostly in Kyaukse and the capital; among the Mons, an old evolved literature, worthy vehicle for the arts, Buddhism and government. The first necessity for a united Burma was a common written language. The only possible alternative then to Mon was, not Burmese, but Pyu. Pyu, though venerable, was now archaic, and its peculiar script a curiosity. In numbers, too, and range, the Pyu were doubtless far inferior to the Mon. In seeking to impose the Mon written language on the peoples of Burma, Kyanzittha had reason enough: but other considerations, I suspect, may have influenced his choice. Like many another conqueror in history, the victor of the Mons was vanquished by their culture.

Luce went further than Blagden by stating a specific date for the erection of the Kubyaukgyi: "It was doubtless built in or about 1113 A.D., shortly after Kyanzittha's death."

Aung-Thwin [2005] challenged Luce's views, denouncing them as part of what Aung-Thwin called the "Mon Paradigm". In Aung-Thwin's alternative paradigm, written OB preceded written OM in Burma, the OB on the Kubyaukgyi was not one of the very earliest, much less the first, attestation of that language, and Kyanzittha's choice of OM for his inscriptions was an idiosyncratic aberration without long-term consequences. Aung-Thwin regarded the OM on the Kubyaukgyi erected after Kyanzittha's death as a last gasp of the language "as a medium for [*Burmese*] royal communication".

On the issue of chronology, Aung-Thwin noted that the name Kyanzittha did not actually appear in the Kubyaukgyi and suggested that

if another calculating era, such as that used in Thailand was intended, or if the date was meant to represent a yet-to-be-completed year, then the reign of this king must be changed accordingly and calculated with 543 BC (hence, to 1083 AD). Since the inscriptions also state that the king had ruled for twenty-eight years, it means the original of the two Kubyaukgyi stones had to have been inscribed thereafter, dating the Kubyaukgyi to 1111, *not* 1112, as conventionally given. The second stone with its newer-looking script could, of course have been inscribed much later than either date, an issue not yet discussed in Burma Studies.

It is not clear which pillar has the "newer-looking script". The question of which pillar came first has also not yet been discussed in Burma studies. Blagden [1909] and Duroiselle [1919a] both regarded the texts on the B pillar as "replicas" of those of the A pillar, but neither stated their reasoning.

Sawada (2002) contained color photographs, word-for-word English glosses, and Japanese translations of all four sides of Kubyaukgyi pillar A. It also contained photographs of all four sides of the other pillar, but only its OB text had English glosses and a Japanese translation.

Kato [2005] translated the Pyu text of the A pillar into Japanese with word-by-word glosses. His interpretation of the Pyu script incorporated several novel features, the most noteworthy being his equation of *ḥ*, *d...ṃ*, and *g...ṃ* with implosives [ɓ ɗ ɠ]. He then compared Pyu with Karen which also has implosives. He stated that *visarga* in Pyu corresponded to Haudricourt's Proto-Karen tone 2, whereas the absence of *visarga* almost always corresponded to Haudricourt's Proto-Karen tones 1 and 3. However, Katō's correspondences were dependent upon his idiosyncratic, unexplained reconstructions of Pyu phonology and semantics.

Krech [2012] was even bolder than Katō while also lacking in substantive argumentation. Krech declared his article to be "the outset of a methodological theory of how to reconstruct ancient languages" (p. 121). But in fact he spent more time criticizing his predecessors than proposing a testable theory.

Unlike previous scholars who looked at the Kubyaukgyi Pyu text with reference to other Pyu inscriptions, Krech viewed that text as an isolated example of what he called "Myazedi Pyu", regarding other Pyu texts as potentially being in other languages without demonstrating any differences between them and the Kubyaukgyi. Solely on the basis of the Kubyaukgyi text, Krech declared that

Myazedi Pyu seems to have been either (i) a Yipho-Naxi-Burmese language with some important contact influence from Kuki-Chin or (ii) it was originally a Kuki-Chin language that has been deeply modified by some member of the Yipho-Naxi-Burmese group (most notably Mranma).

Krech did not provide any evidence that would justify either of these classifications of "Myazedi Pyu". Given Krech's statement that "the narrower we can identify the genetic affiliation of a certain language the less arbitrary the lexical identifications will tend to be," it is likely that his glosses for the Myazedi are rooted in his assumptions about the position of Pyu in the Trans-Himalayan family. However, like Katō, Krech did not explain how he arrived at his glosses. Moreover, Katō and Krech even supplied conflicting glosses for words whose meanings eluded most of their predecessors: e.g.,

ḥa dom (line 1)

Blagden: (no gloss)

Shafer: (no gloss)

Tha Myat: '*nibbāna*' from Pali *pada* which actually means 'foot' or, by extension, 'unit' (e.g., of verse) but not *nibbāna* itself.

Than Tun: (no gloss)

Katō: 'believe' + 'great'

Krech: 'Buddhist teachings'

In contrast with Katō and Krech, Yabu [2006] was on firmer ground in two senses; he dealt with the far better understood OB text of the Kubyaukgyi, and he did so without resorting to groundless speculations. He translated the OB text into both word-for-word and natural Japanese

and supplied transcriptions into both the Latin and modern Burmese scripts. Like Nishida, he used the OB text primarily as a source of OB-WB sound correspondences, though he also provided notes on grammatical morphemes and expressions now extinct in modern Burmese.

Jenny and McCormick (2014), a handbook article on OM, contained word-for-word and natural English translations of the OM text of the Myazedi as a sample of the language.

Jenny [2015] glossed OM, OB, and Pyu versions of a single line of the Kubyaukgyi to compare what he viewed as permissive causatives in the three languages.

Apart from the two 21st century translations mentioned above, there has been no work on the OM text of the Kubyaukgyi since Blagden, and there has never been an in-depth study of the Pali text. This is perhaps understandable since there are older and longer OM texts, and the Pali text is but a drop in the vast sea of Pali literature, whereas the OB text is one of the earliest in the language, and the Pyu text is one of the very few in that language with counterparts in other languages and is therefore a major key to the decipherment of Pyu.

2 Objectives of the present study

My study differs from its predecessors in several ways.

First, our readings are based on Reflectance Transformation Imaging (RTI) images made in 2014 and 2016. Unlike photographs or rubbings, RTI images can be viewed with simulated lighting using a number of filters to bring out details and exclude noise for more accurate readings. My study is the first to incorporate Arlo Griffiths' identification of subscript final consonants in the B version of the text.

Second, I have compiled the first five-way glossary of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi. Although I claim no expertise in OB, OM, and Pali, I have synthesized the work of my predecessors and colleagues to use those languages to decipher Pyu. Whenever possible, I have explicitly matched Pyu words with their counterparts in the other languages.

3 The text of the Kubyaukgyi inscription (A = PYU 7 and B = PYU 8)

3.1 Conventions

We use the following conventions in our edition of the text.

Abbreviations not in Leipzig conventions:

- AOR aorist
- ATTR attributive
- DES desiderative
- EMPH emphatic
- HON honorific
- LN locative noun

- PN personal or place name
- PPP past passive participle
- RLS realis
- SO subordinator

- TMP temporal

- xCM exclamatory marker

uncertain reading

- () editorial restoration of lost text
- < > editorial addition of omitted text
- « » scribal insertion
- { } scribal deletion
- ? illegible akṣara
- C illegible consonant element of an akṣara
- + lost akṣara
- ◇ punctuation space
- Z intonation marker

3.2 The Old Burmese text of A (PYU 7)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths, Julian K. Wheatley, and Marc Miyake

1. || śrī || namo buddhāya || purhā skhañ· sāsanā °anhac· ta-
glory reverence Buddha.DAT.SG Buddha lord religion year one
Glory! Reverence to the Buddha! One thousand six hundred and
2. c· thoñ· khrok[·] ryā nhac· chāy[·] het· nhac· lon·
one thousand six hundred two ten eight year elapse
twenty-eight years of Lord Buddha's religion
3. liy·brī rakā || °īy· °arimaddanapur· maññ· su praññ·
PFV SO this PN name ATTR city
having elapsed, in this city named Arimaddanapura,
4. nhik· °ā || śrī tribhuvanāditya dhamma-rāj· maññ· su ma-
LOC ? HON PN dharma-king named ATTR king
there was a king named Śrī Tribhuvanāditya

5. n̄· phlac· °e°a· || thiv· mañ· °e°a· pāy· mayā ta-
king be RLS that king GEN HON wife one
Dhammarāja. That king's wife
6. c· yok· su kā trilokavaṭaṃsakā devī
one person that TOP PN queen
was named Queen
7. maññ· °e°a· || thiv· pāy· mayā sā tamuleh· rā[ja]-
name RLS that HON wife son as.for PN
Trilokavaṭaṃsakā. As for that queen's son, he
8. kumār· maññ· °e°a· || thiv· mañ· kā kyon· suṃ rvoh·
PN name RLS that king TOP slave three village
was named Rājākumāra. That king gave the queen
9. teh· pāy· mayā °ā piy· °e°a· || thiv· pāy· ma-
EMPH HON wife DAT give RLS that HON wife
three slave villages. That queen
10. yā syī· kha rakā || thiv· pāy· mayā tan·chā nhañ'· thi-
wife die PST SO that HON wife ornament and that
died, and the king gave that queen's ornaments
11. v· kyon· suṃ rvoh· su nhañ'· teh· thiv· pāy· mayā
that slave three village that and EMPH that HON wife
and those three villages of slaves again
12. sā °a sā rājākumār· maññ· so °ā mañ· piy· tuṃ
SON DAT SON PN name NMLZ DAT king give do.again
to the queen's son named Rājākumāra.
13. °e°a· || thuiv· mañ· °anhac· nhac· chāy· het· nhac· mañ· mū bri ru-
RLS that king year two ten eight year king reign complete so
That king reigned twenty-eight years.
14. y'[-] °e°a· || siy· [kha]mū nā su rhov· nhik· teh· || thuiv· rājaku-
so RLS die about.to ill ATTR time EMPH that PN
When he was ill and about to die, the queen's son
15. mār· maññ· su pay· mayā sā mimī keiv· muy· so mañ·
PN name ATTR HON wife son self ACC raise ATTR king
named Rājākumāra remembered the favors of

16. grī klaññjo °ok·mi rakā || rhuy· °ati su purhā skhañ· °a
great favor remember so gold all ATTR Buddha lord image
the great king who raised him. He made a pure gold image
17. chañ· plu ruy'· °e°a· nhap·liy· su rhov· teh· °iy· si-
image make so RLS offer ATTR time EMPH this man-
of Lord Buddha, and when he offered it, he
18. °a· min'· °e°a· || °iy· rhuy· purhā kā ña skhaña °aphei°a· °ati°a· ky-
-ner speak RLS this gold Buddha TOP my lord for I slave
spoke thus: "As for this gold Buddha, I, [your] servant, have made"
19. on· plo°a· su.teh· || kyon· su[m] rvoh· °atui°a· kyo-
servant make NMLZ slave three village slave
it for my lord. As for the three villages
20. n· ña skhañ· piy· su saññ· kā °iya rhuya pur[h]ā ā °atui°a· kyo-
slave my lord give NMLZ TOP TOP this gold Buddha DAT slave
of slaves my lord gave [me], I give [those] slaves to this
21. n· piy· ye°a· || thiv· rhov· teh· mañ· nhac[·]klui°a· rakā koñ·
slave give RLS that time EMPH king pleased so good
gold Buddha. At that very moment, the king was pleased, and
22. lhen'·teh[·] koñ· lhen'·teh· min'· ruy'· °e°a· sañgrī
would.be good would.be speak so RLS master
said, "That would be good! That would be good!" The lord
23. mahāther· || sañgrī muggaliputtati[ssa]tther· || sañgrī su-
PN master PN master PN
Mahāthera, the lord Muggaliputtatissatthera, the lord Su-
24. medhapaṇḍit· || sañgrī brahmapāl· || sañgrī brahmadi-
PN master PN master PN
medhapaṇḍita, the lord Brahmapāla, the lord Brahmade-
25. v· || sañgrī son[·] || sañgrī sañghasena vara-paṇḍi-
PN master PN master PN best-pun-
va, the lord Sona, the lord Sañghasena Varapaṇḍi-
26. t· || thuiv· skhañ· tui°a· °amhok·teh· mañ· [r]iy· son· °e°a·
dit that lord PL presence king water pour RLS
ta, in the presence of those lords, the king poured water.

27. || thiv· brī rakā thuiv· rājakumār· maññ· su pay· mayā °asā
 that complete so that PN name ATTR HON wife son
 After that was finished, the queen's son named Rājakumāra
28. thiv· rhuy· purhā thāpanā ruy'· °e°a· °iy· rhuy· °athot· mū so
 that gold Buddha enshrine so RLS this gold spire do ATTR
 enshrined the gold Buddha and made a cave-pagoda with
29. kū plo°a· °e°a· || plo°a· brī rakā °iy· kū purhā lhot·
 cave-pagoda make RLS make complete so this cave-pagoda Buddha dedicate
 this gold sire. Having made that, when he dedicated
30. su rhov· nhik· teh· || sak·munalon· tac· rvoh· || rapā-
 ATTR time LOC EMPH PN one village PN
 this cave-pagoda and its Buddha, he brought the one village of Sakmunalor,
31. y· tac· rvoh· || hen·buiv· tac· rvoh(·) || °iy· kyon·
 PN one village PN one village this slave
 the one village of Rapāy, the one village of Henbuiv - these
32. sum rvoh· yo ruy'· °e°a· || thuiv· rājakumār· maññ· su pay·
 three village bring so RLS that PN name ATTR HON
 three villages of slaves. The queen's son named Rājakumāra
33. mayā°a· sā °iya kū purhā °ā riy· son· ruy'· °e°a· °iy· sei-
 wife son this cave-pagoda Buddha DAT water pour so RLS this way
 poured water for this cave-pagoda and its Buddha, and
34. °a· min'· °e°a· || °iy· nā °amho°a· kā sarvvaññūtaññā-
 way speak RLS this my deed TOP omni-
 spoke thus: "May this deed of mine be the cause
35. ṇ· prajññā ra °am'· sū °akroñ· phlac· ciy'· teh· || ṇa
 science wisdom get FUT ATTR cause be CAUS EMPH my
 of my obtaining omniscience and wisdom in the future. After
36. noñ· °ā ṇa sā laññ·goñ· || ṇa mliy· laññ·goñ· || ṇa °achu-
 after DAT my son be.it my grandson be.it my relatives
 me, be it my son, be it my grandson, be it
37. y· laññ·goñ· || sū tac·thū laññ·goñ· || °iy· purhā
 relatives be.it person other be.it this Buddha
 my relative, be it another person, if they

38. °ā nā lhū kha su kyon· °anhip·°acaka teh· mū mu-
 DAT I offer PST ATTR slave ill.treatment EMPH do if
 poorly treat the slaves that I offered to this Buddha,
39. kā || °arimittiryā purhā skhañ· °aphu ra ciy· || = ||
 if PN Buddha lord not.behold get CAUS
 may they not get to behold the Lord Buddha!”

3.3 The Old Mon text of A (PYU 7)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths and Marc Miyake

1. || śrī || namo buddhāya || śrī || sās· kyek buddha tirley·
 glory reverence Buddha.DAT.SG glory religion sacred.being Buddha my.lord
 Glory! Reverence to the Buddha! Glory!
2. kuli °ār· moy· lñim· turov· klañ· ḃār· cvas· diññcām· cnām·
 last go one thousand six hundred two ten eight year
 When the religion of the Lord Buddha had lasted for 1628 years
3. tuy· || ḃe[y·] [ḃu]ñ· (°a)rimaddanapur· vo°a· smin· śrī ˘tribhuvanādi-
 finish in city PN this king HON PN
 in the city of Arimaddanapura [Pagan], Śrī Tribhuvanādi-
4. tya dhammarāj· das· || gna.kyek· smin· goḥh· moy·(·) tri-
 PN dharma-king be queen king that one PN
 -tyadhammarāja became (king). One of the king’s queens was
5. lokavaṭṭamsakā devī °imo°a· || kon· gna.kyek· goḥ-
 PN squeen name child queen that
 named Trilokavaṭṭamsakādevī. The son of that queen was
6. h· rājakumār· °imo°a· || smin· goḥh· kil· ḃik· pi tvā-
 that PN name king that give slave three vil-
 named Rājakumāra. The king gave three villages of slaves
7. ññ· ku gna.kyek goḥh· || kāl· gna.kyek· goḥh· cuti
 -lage OBL queen that time queen that die
 to the queen. When the queen died,
8. °ār· || °ut· kiryā gna.kyek· goḥ ku ḃik· pi tvāññ· goḥ
 go all apparel queen that OBL slave three village that
 all the queen’s possessions and all three of the villages of slaves,

9. smin̄· tun· kil· ku kon· gna.kyek· ma °imo°a· rājaku-
king return give OBL child queen REL name PN
the king gave to the son of the queen, who was named
10. mār· goḥ || smin̄· goḥh· kmin· ḃār cvas· diññcām· cnām· tuy·
PN that king that reign two ten eight year finish
Rājakumāra. The king reigned for 28 years,
11. [kā]l· smin̄· goḥ 'jey· ññan· scuti || kaun· gna.kyek ma °i-
time king that sick near IRR.die child queen REL name
and when he became sick, approaching death, the queen's son named
12. mo°a· rājakumār· goḥ [m]ir·nas· guṇ· ma smin̄· °iññcim·
name PN this remember virtue REL king feed
Rājakumāra remembered the virtues that the king did for (lit. fed)
13. jirku kin[d]aṃ kyek· thar· moy· °ār· tu[b]ok· smin̄· mu-
body build sacred.thing gold one go offer king inform
him. He cast a golden Buddha image and went to offer it to the king, telling
14. nas· rov· vo°a· || kyek· thar· vo°a· °ey· ḃik· pa ram-
inform manner this sacred.thing gold this 1SG make portion
him, "This golden Buddha image I have made on your behalf,
15. po°a· tirla ḃik· pi tvāññ· ma tirla kil· ku °ey· goḥh·
portion lord slave three village REL lord give OBL 1SG that
my Lord. Those three villages of slaves which you gave me,
16. °ey· ḃik· kil· ku kyek· vo°a· tirla °anumodanā da°a·
1SG slave give OBL sacred.thing this lord approve FOC
I give to this image. May you approve, my Lord."
17. || kāl· goḥ smin̄· sḃik· gap.pumas· thic· °ā thic· °ā smin̄· p·
time that king pleased pleased good go good go king do
Then the king was pleased and saying, "well done, well done," gave his
18. sādḃukār· || kāl· goḥh· tirla poy· mhā[the]r· || ticā-
approval time that lord 1PL senior.monk lord
approval. Then [in the presence] of our lord, the Senior Monk, the lord
19. r· muggaliputtat(i)ssatther· || ticār· sumedhapaṇḃit· || ti-
lord PN lord PN lord
Mugaliputtatissathera, the lord Sumedhapaṇḃita, the

20. [cā]r brahmapāl· || ticār· brahmadiv· || ticār· son·
 lord PN lord PN lord PN
 lord Brahmapāla, the lord Brahmadeva, the lord Son,
21. || ticār· saṅghasena vara-paṇḍit· || kinta tirla
 lord PN best-pundit before lord
 and the lord Saṅghasena, best of pundits, before these lords,
22. ta goḥ smin· cut· ḍek· han· ti || blaḥ goḥ kon· gna.kye-
 PL that king put water LOC soil end that child queen
 the king poured water on the water. After that, the son of the queen,
23. k· ma °imo°a· rājakumār· goḥ ket· kyek· thar· goḥ
 queen REL name PN that take sacred.thing gold that
 queen, who was named Rājakumāra, took the gold image
24. thāpanā kandaṁ guoh· cloṇ· thar· [v]o°a· || kāl· busac· kye-
 enshrine build cave-pagoda spire gold this time dedicate sacred.thing
 and enshrined it, building this cave-pagoda with the golden spire. When he dedicated this image,
25. k· guoh· vo°a· kon· gna.kyek goḥ ket· sak·muna- e
 sacred.thing cave-pagoda this child queen that take PN
 and cave, the queen's son brought from the villages of
26. lor· moy· tvāññ· || rahay· moy· tvāññ· || ññahḥ· (gir°u-)
 PN one village PN one village PN
 Sakmunalor, Rapāy, and Ñaḥ Gir
27. y· moy· tvāññ· || °a'ut· ḍik· pi tvāññ· goḥ cut· ḍe(k· ku)
 PN one village all slave three village that put water OBL
 'Uy, all the slaves of the three villages, and poured water for
28. kyek· thar· ma māpanā hin· goḥ vo°a· rādhanā rov· (vo°a)
 sacred.thing gold REL enshrine for cave-pagoda this pray manner this
 the gold image that he had enshrined for this cave, [and] prayed thus:
māpanā is an error for *thāpanā* in B influenced by the preceding *ma*.
29. || sinraṇ· °e°a· vo°a· °or· dap· het· ku gvo°a· sarvvaññ(uta)-
 deed 1SG this OPT be cause OBL attainment omniscience
 "May this deed of mine be a cause for the attainment of omniscience!
30. ññāṇ· || kon· °ey· laḥ || cov· °ey· laḥ || ku(lo)
 omniscience child 1SG or grandchild 1SG or kinsman
 Be it my child or my grandchild or my kinsman

31. °ey· laḥ || ññāḥ c'ēñ· laḥ || yal· pa X °upadrov· ku ḍ(i)-
1SG or person other or if do violence OBL ser-
or [any] other person, if he do violence to the slaves
32. k· ma °ey· kil· ku kyek· vo°a· yañ· ññīr·ññāc· kye-
vant REL 1SG give OBL sacred.thing this EMPH sight ho-
whom I am giving to this very image, may he
33. k· trey· mettey· laḥ °or· ḍeh· go°a· || 0 ||
-ly sacred.being PN PROH OPT he get
not get sight of holy Metteya!

3.4 The Pali text of A (PYU 7)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths and Marc Miyake

Stanzas are numbered with Roman numerals in parentheses: e.g., *jina-sā(2)sanasmim* indicates that line 2 begins in the middle of that word after *sā*.

1. || śrī || (I) buddhādikaṃ vatthu-varaṃ namitvā puññaṃ
glory buddha.beginning.M.ACC.SG object-excellent.PN bow.ABS merit.ACC.SG
kataṃ yaṃ jina-sā
do.PPP.N.ACC.SG REL.N.ACC.SG conqueror-
Glory! After bowing to the Buddha and the other excellent objects, I shall
2. sanasmim °anādikaṃ rājakumāra-nāma-dheyyena vakkhā-
dispensation.N.LOC.SG perpetual?.3SG.N.ACC PN-name-assigning.M.INS.SG speak
speak of the perpetual ... in the name of Rājakumāra in the Conqueror's dispen-
3. mi sunātha me taṃ || (II) nibbānā loka-nāthassa °aṭṭha-vī-
.FUT.1SG hear.IMP.2PL 1SG.ACC 3SG.N.ACC nirvana.ABL.SG world-lord.GEN.SG eight-
sation. Listen to me! A thousand six hundred twenty-
4. sādhiḥ gate sahasse pana vassānaṃ cha-sate
twenty.plus.LOC.SG go.PPP.N.LOC.SG thousand.LOC.SG and year.GEN.PL six-hundred.LOC.SG
cāpare ta-
and.later.LOC.SG thus
eight years having thus passed since the nirvana of the lord of the
5. thā || (III) °arimaddana-nāmasmi pure °āsi maha-bbalo
thus PN-name.LOC.SG city.LOC.SG be.AOR.3SG great-power.M.NOM.SG
rājā
king.NOM.SG
word, in a city named Arimaddana was a great and mighty King

6. tibhuvanādicco °udiccādicca-vaṃsa-jo || (IV) tassāse-
 PN.NOM.SG exalted.sun-race-born.M.NOM.SG 3SG.M.DAT.be.AOR.3SG.one
 Tribhuvanādiya, born of the exalted solar race. He had
7. kā piyā devi sā tilokavaṭaṃsikā hi-
 .F.NOM.SG beloved.F.NOM.SG queen.NOM.SG 3SG.F.NOM PN.NOM.SG desiring.
 a beloved queen Trilokakvaṭaṃsikā, desirous
8. tesī kusalā sabba-kiccesu pana rājino || (V)
 others'.welfare.M.NOM.SG skillful.F.NOM.SG. all-work.LOC.PL and king.GEN.SG
 ta-
 3SG.F.DAT
 of others' welfare, and skillful in all the affairs of the king.
9. ssāseko suto rājakumāro nāma nāma-
 .be.AOR.3SG.one.M.NOM.SG son.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG name.NOM.SG by.
10. to °amacco rāja-kiccesu byāvato satimā
 name minister.NOM.SG king-work.LOC.PL zealous.M.NOM.SG prudent.M.NOM.SG
11. vidū || (VI) °adā gāma-ttayaṃ tassā deviyā so
 wise.M.NOM.SG give.AOR.3SG village-triad.ACC.SG F.DAT.SG queen.DAT.SG 3SG.M.NOM
 ma-
 king.
12. hīpati pasanno sabbadā dāsa-paribhogena bhuññitum
 NOM.SG devoted.M.NOM.SG always slave-material.for.enjoyment.INST.SG enjoy.INF
13. || (VII) °aniccatā-vasaṃ tassā gatāya pana deviyā rā-
 non.continuity-authority.NOM.SG 3SG.F.GEN GOPPP.DAT.SG and queen.GEN.SG king
14. ja rājakumārassa °adā gāma-ttaya puna || (VIII) °aṭha-vīsa-
 .NOM.SG PN.DAT.SG give.AOR.3SG village-triad.ACC.SG again eight-twen-
15. ti-vassāni rajjaṃ dhammena kāriya māranantika-roḡassa
 -ty-year.NOM.PL kingdom.ACC.SG righteousness.INS.SG do.ABS death.end-illness.GEN.SG
16. vasaṃ patte narādhipe || (IX) saranto
 control.ACC.SG reach.PPP.LOC.SG man.ruler.LOC.SG remember.PRS.PTCP.M.NOM.SG.
 dhamma-rājassa mahantaṃ gu-
 righteous-king.GEN.SG great.M.ACC.SG vir
17. ṇa-saññcayaṃ kāretvā satthuno bimbaṃ sabbasovaṇṇa-
 -tue-quantity.ACC.SG do.CAUS.ABS teacher.GEN.SG image.ACC.SG all-gold
18. yaṃ subhaṃ || (X) gahetvā taṃ mahantena sakkārena
 .N.ACC.SG beautiful.N.ACC.SG take.ABS M.SG.ACC great.M.INS.SG reverence.INS.SG
 sumānaso
 joyful.M.NOM.SG

19. °upasaṅkamma rājānaṃ °āha cintitaṃ attano || (XI) bhāgaṃ
 approach.ABS king.DAT.PL say.PRF.3SG thought.ACC.SG self.GEN.SG part.ACC.SG
 katvā-
 do
20. n-idaṃ satthu-bimbaṃ sovaṇṇayaṃ subhaṃ °akāsiṃ
 .ABS-this.N.ACC.SG teacher-image.N.ACC.SG gold.N.ACC.SG beautiful.N.ACC.SG make.AOR.1SG
 vo va-
 2PL.DAT excellent
21. raṃ puññaṃ sāmi tumhe numodatha || (XII) gāma-ttayaṃ
 .N.ACC.SG merit.ACC.SG lord.VOC.SG 2PL.NOM rejoice.IMP.2PL village-triad.NOM.SG
 pi vo
 also 2PL.INS
22. sāmi pubbe dinnan tu me °ahaṃ °imasseva
 lord.VOC.SG in.the.past give.PPP.N.NOM.SG now 1SG.DAT 1SG.NOM this.DAT.SG.only
 munindassa demi ta-
 sage.chief.GEN.SG give.PRS.1SG 3SG
23. ññ cānumodatha || (XIII) °evaṃ vutte mahīpālo roge-
 N.ACC and.rejoice.IMP.2PL say.PPP.LOC.SG king.NOM.SG illness
24. nātura-mānaso sādhu sādhu ti vatvāna
 .INS.SG.afflicted-mind.havingM.NOM.SG good good QUOT say.ABS
 tuṭha-hattho
 pleased.PPP-delightedPPP.M.NOM.SG
25. pamodito || (XIV) dayāparo mahāthero
 rejoiced.PPP.M.NOM.SG compassion.supreme.M.NOM.SG great-thera.NOM.SG
 thero muggali-
 thera.NOM.SG PN
26. puttako sumedhatta sumedho ti laddha-nāmo ca
 PN.NOM.SG wise.self.M.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG QUOT obtain.PPP-name.NOM.SG and
 paṇḍito ||
 pandit.NOM.SG ||
27. (XV) brahmapālo tathā brahmadevo sampanna-sīlavā sono
 .PN.NOM.SG thus PN.NOM.SG succeed.PPP-virtuous.M.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG
28. bahu-ssuto saṃghasenavho vara-paṇḍito || (XVI) °etesariṃ pa-
 much-learned.M.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG excellent-pundit.NOM.SG this.3PL.GEN and
29. na bhikkhūnaṃ saṃmukhā so su-mānaso jalaṃ
 and monk.GEN.PL in.front 3SG.M.NOM good-minded.M.NOM.SG water.ACC.SG
 pātesi katvāna sa-
 fall.CAUS.AOR.3SG do.ABS witness

30. kkhin tu vasudhā-talaṃ || (XVII) tato so taṃ
 .ACC.SG now earth-surface.ACC.SG then 3SG.M.NOM 3SG.N.ACC
 mahāmacco bimbam sova-
 great-minster.NOM.SG image.ACC.SG gold
31. ṇṇayaṃ subhaṃ paṭiṭhāpiya kāresi guhaṃ
 .N.ACC.SG beautiful.N.ACC.SG establish.CAUS.ABS do.AOR.3SG cave.ACC.SG
 kaññcana-thūpikaṃ ||
 gold-spined.F.ACC.SG
32. (XVIII) katvāna maṅgalaṃ buddha-patimāya guhāya ca °akāsevaṃ
 do.ABS ceremony.ACC.SG buddha-image.DAT.SG cave.DAT.SG and doAOR.3SG.thus
 paṇī-
 aspiration
33. dhānaṃ nibbinno bhava-saṅkate || (XIX) karontena mayā
 .ACC.SG weary.PPP.NOM.SG existence-created.LOC.SG do.PRS.PTCP.INS.SG 1SG.INS
 °etaṃ yaṃ pu-
 this.N.ACC.SG REL.N.ACC.SG merit
34. ññaṃ taṃ samācitaṃ hotu
 .ACC.SG 3SG.N.ACC accumulate.PST.PASS.PTCP.N.ACC.SG be.IMP.3SG
 sabbañña-ñña-pativedhā-
 omniscience-wisdom-attainment
35. ya paccayo || (XX) yattakā tu mayā dāsā
 .DAT.SG cause.NOM.SG however.manyM.NOM.SG but 1SG.INS slave.NOM.PL
 gāma-ttaya-nivā-
 village-triad-dwelling
36. sino dinnā guhāya sovaṇṇa-patimāya mahesi-
 .M.ACC.PL give.PPP.M.NOM.PL cave.DAT.SG gold-image.DAT.SG great.sage
37. no || (XXI) putto me vā paputto vā °añño vā pana
 .GEN.SG son.NOM.SG 1SG.GEN or grandson.NOM.SG or other.NOM.SG or and
 ñña-
 kinsman
38. tako yo koci pāpa-saṅkappo naro °assaddha-
 .NOM.SG REL.M.NOM.SG whoever.M.NOM.SG evil-thought.M.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG unbelieving-
39. mānaso || (XXII) kareyyupadduvaṃ tesam dāsānaṃ so
 mind.M.NOM.SG do.OPT.3SG.oppression.ACC.SG M.DAT.PL slave.DAT.PL 3SG.M.NOM
 narādhamo
 man.vilest
40. metteyya-dipadindassa dassanaṃ nāthigacchatū
 metteyya-two.foot.lord.GEN.SG sight.ACC.SG not.attain.IMP.3SG QUOT
 not attain the sight of Metteyya, lord of bipeds!

41. ti || 0 ||
QUOT

3.5 The Pyu text of A (PYU 7)

1. 1 || siri || dathagaṃda ḃadoṃ ḃaṃḃ ḃiṃḃ pduṃ sgu.daṃḃ.ḃa.tva 1000 [600]
1 glory tathagāta nirvāṇa HON RLS enter? TMP 1000 600
Glory! Since the Tathāgata ... nirvāṇa, one thousand six hundred
2. 20 hram °o sniḃ ḃiṃḃ tvaṃṃḃ tha-daṃṃ // yaṃ tim priḃ rimadhanarbu °o rmi
20 eight POSS year RLS elapse PFV this LOC city PN NMLZ be.name
ḃiṃḃ si //
RLS COP
twenty-eight years have elapsed. This was in the city named Arimaddanapura.
3. sri tribhuvamnadimṃtya dhama-raja °o rmi ḃiṃḃ si // °o domḃ ḃaZ ḃaṃḃ
HON PN dhamma-king NMLZ be.name RLS COP POSS ? OR HON
°o rvaṃḃ ma-
POSS ruler? wife
There was a righteous king named Śrī Tribhuvanāditya. His beloved, or the ruler's
4. yaḃ triḃogavamdasagamvīm ḃiṃḃ si °o rmi // pau °o saḃ rajaguma ḃiṃḃ
wife PN queen RLS be NMLZ name that POSS son PN RLS
wife, was named Queen Trilokavāṃsakā. Her son was named
5. si °o rmi // °o vaṃ traḃ kra hoḃ ḃiṃḃ paṃḃ toḃZ // pau ḃaṃḃ mayaḃ ḃiṃḃ
be POSS name POSS LN slave village three RLS give PFV that HON wife RLS
hi ta-daṃṃ
die PRF
Rājakumāra. To her [the king] gave three villages of slaves. That queen died.
6. ma[ya]ḃ °o dra traḃ kra hoḃ ḃiṃḃ paṃḃ tḃaḃ ḃaṃḃ mayaḃ °o saḃ
wife POSS personal.item slave village three RLS give again HON wife POSS son
rajaguma °o vaṃ //
PN POSS LN
[The king] gave [his] wife's personal items and the three villages of slaves again to the queen's son Rājakumāra.
7. pau ḃaṃḃ tdaṃḃ sniḃ rpu hram biṃḃ ta daṃṃ // ḃiṃḃ sriḃ ḃiṃḃ hniṃḃ ḃiṃḃ
that HON king YEAR twenty eight RLS place PRF RLS reign RLS sick NMLZ
hi °o mtu duṃ
die POSS vicinity LOC
That king was in place [i.e., ruled] for twenty-eight years. Having reigned, having become sick, [he] was near

8. roḥ // pau ɓamḥ mayah °o sah rajaguma ɓimḥ si °o rmi // °o diṃm
 RLS.COP that HON wife POSS SON PN RLS be NMLZ name 3 acc

death. The queen's son was named Rājakumāra.

9. ɓimḥ mtau ma pau tdamḥ to °o kḏetroḥ diṃm ɓimḥ mdaum.hah.ḏah
 RLS raise REL that king righteous POSS favors RLS remember PFV
 damṃ // pau ɓamḥ
 that HON

[He] remembered the favors of the righteous king who raised him. He

10. ɓudha °o chaḥ.bo bradima tha [tlu] ɓimḥ se kyah // pau ɓamḥ ɓudha ɓimḥ
 buddha POSS likeness image golden entirely RLS make CAUS that HON buddha RLS
 tuḥ
 offer

caused a pure gold image in the likeness of Buddha to be made. He offered the Buddha

11. P

thmuḥ ḏoḥ yaṃ na ɓi[mḥ] tdiṃḥ toḥZ // yaṃ ɓamḥ ɓudha tha ɓamḥ
 presence LOC this manner RLS speak PFV this HON buddha golden HON
 rah.sah ɓimḥ
 on.behalf.of RLS

into [the royal] presence and spoke thus: "I made this golden Buddha

12. se ma ɓuḥ ɓamḥ °o vaṃ paṃḥ ce choḥZ // yaṃ traḥ kra hoḥ ɓimḥ paṃḥ
 make NMLZ do HON POSS LN give IRR XCM this slave village three RLS give
 on behalf of [my] lord, and I shall give it to him!" [The king] gave [him] the three villages

13. ma ɓuḥ // yaṃ ɓamḥ hra tha °o vaṃ paṃḥ cheZ // pau ḏoḥ ɓamḥ tdamḥ
 NMLZ do this HON sacred.image golden POSS LN give IRR that in HON king
 ɓimḥ kim-
 RLS pleased

of slaves, [and he] would give [them] to this golden Buddha image. At that point the king was

14. -pha damṃ ɓimḥ na ha pra choḥ ha pra choḥ ɓimḥ si // pau °o domḥ traḥ
 pleased PRF RLS exclaim good do XCM good do XCM RLS be that POSS after ?
 ɓamḥ
 HON

pleased and exclaimed, "Well done! Well done!" After that the ? lord

15. mahaṭhe / traḥ ɓamḥ mugamḏubudadisatḥe / traḥ ɓamḥ «su»medhabadiṃm
 PN ? HON PN ? HON PN PN

Mahāthera, the ? lord Muggaliputtatissatthera, the ? lord Sumedhapañḏita,

16. / traḥ ɓamḥ vrahmaba / traḥ ɓamḥ vradamyoḥ / tra[h] ɓamḥ su / traḥ ɓamḥ
 ? HON PN ? HON PN ? HON PN ? HON
 the ? lord Brahmapāla, the ? lord Brahmadeva, the ? lord Sona, the ? lord
17. sagamsi vamrabadiṃm // pau traḥ ɓamḥ sagha tvo °o hña.diṃ dum tdamḥ
 PN that ? HON saṅgha PL POSS presence LOC king
 Saṅghasena Varapaṇḍita - in the presence of the ? Saṅgha, the joyful
18. tu ɓamḥ ɓimḥ cha toḥ tdum // pau ɓimḥ ta-damṃ mayah °o sa[h] raja-
 joyful HON RLS pour PFV water that RLS PRF wife POSS son PN
 king poured water. That having been done, his wife's son, whose
19. guma ɓimḥ si °o rmi ma [//] ɓimḥ stabana [b]udha tha ɓi(m)ḥ se
 PN RLS be POSS name NMLZ RLS enshrine buddha golden RLS make
 gom °o sto tha ɓi(mḥ)
 cave-pagoda POSS spire golden RLS
 name was Rājakumāra, enshrined the golden Buddha, made a golden spire of a cave-pagoda,
 and
20. ta-damṃ // pau gom °o hḍ[ī] ɓimḥ samḥ [r]oḥ // [sa]manardo[h]
 PRF that cave-pagoda POSS dedication RLS pronounce when PN
 kra tam / rabai kra [ta]m [/ j]i[m]-
 village one PN village one PN
 put [things in place]. He performed the dedication for that cave-pagoda. The one village of
 Sakmunalor, the one village of Rapāy, the one
21. vuḥ kra tam // yam traḥ kra hoḥ diṃm ɓimḥ diṃm damṃ // yam ɓamḥ
 PN village one this slave village three ACC RLS assemble PRF this HON
 mayah (°o saḥ)
 wife POSS son
 village of Jimvuḥ - he assembled these three slave villages. This son of the queen,
22. rajaguma yam gom ɓu[dha] °o varṃ tdum ɓimḥ chai ta-damṃ // yam na
 PN this cave-pagoda buddha POSS LN water RLS pour PRF this manner
 ɓimḥ diṃm ch[o] (// yam)
 RLS pray QUOT this
 Rājakumāra, poured water for this cave-pagoda Buddha. [He] prayed thus, "May this
23. ma gamḥ pra buḥ saveññudeñña breñña ɓimḥ.ɓimḥ paṃḥ che naḥ tim pḍamḥ paZ
 REL I do do omniscience wisdom myself give IRR cause LOC base may.be
 //

which I do be the basis for a cause to give myself omniscience and wisdom!

24. *yaṃ tra tīṃ mtu knaṃḥ duṃ gi saḥ ḍa / gi pli la gi sruḥ ḍaZ*
 this slave LOC regards FUT LOC my son or my grandchild or my kinsman
mra.ja.hṇa ḍa yaṃ
 or other.person or this
 In regards to these slaves in the future, whether it be my son or my grandchild or my kinsman or another person, suppose someone
25. *(ḥu)[dha] °o vaṃ gaṃḥ ḥḍiṃḥ toḥ ma diṃṃ / ga ḥñiṃ.chi ga bro.pḍaṃ ma*
 buddha POSS LN I dedicate PFV NMLZ ACC if violence if violence REL
taḥ ṇuḥ ḥuḥ //
 be.evill? be.unbelieving? do //
 performs violence or evil and unbelieving oppression upon those whom I have dedicated to this Buddha.
26. *yaṃ baṃḥ ḥuḍha °arimedeyaṃ ḍaṃṃ ḥaḥ kḍiṃ.kchiṃḥ tīṃ tmu ma paṃḥ che*
 this HON buddha PN PRF not get.sight.of LOC presence ? give IRR
choḥ //Z
xcm
 May [they] not get the sight of this Buddha Āriyametteyya and be permitted in [his] presence!"

3.6 The Old Burmese text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Marc Miyake

1. || śra || namo buddhā /// rhā skhaṇa sāsanaṇ tac· thoṇ· khrok· ryā
2. n(h)ac· chāy[·] he /// n· līy· brī rakā || °īy· °arimaddanapur· ma
3. /// vanādityadhammarāj· maññ· su maṇ· phlac· °e
4. /// (y)ā tac· yok· su kā trilocavaṭaṃ
5. /// thuiv· pay· mayā sā kā rājakumā
6. /// k[y]on· suṃ rvoh· pay· mayā °ā
7. /// (rakā) || pay· mayā (ta)
8. /// su nhaṇ'· pa[y·] /// (°a) [s]ā rājakumā
9. /// tu[rṃ] °e °a || thuiv· maṇ· °anhac· nhac· chāy·
10. /// °e°a· || sīy· kha mū nā su rhov· nhik· Ce
11. /// r· maññ· su pay· mayā°a· sā ḍ mi mī
12. /// kla ṇñjo °ok· mi rakā || r[h](u)[y]· °a
13. /// [ṇ](·) [p]lu ru /// °e°a· nhap· līy· su rhov· ///

14. /// ya /// na ◇ [°e °a] ll °iy· rhuy· purhā k[ā]
15. °aphei°a· °atei°a(·) /// y /// pl[o]°a· su teh· l ///
16. n· sum rvoh· °athui°a· kyon(·) ña skhañ· piy· su saññ· kā ///
17. rhuy· pu rhā °ā °a ◇ tui°a· kyon(·) /// y· ye°a· ll thiv· rhov·
18. ◇ h· mañ· nhac· klui°a· rakā koñ· lh(e)ñ·teh· koñ· ///
19. teh· min'· ru ◇ y'· °e°a· ll sa (ñg)r(ī) mahāther· ll sa ñgrī ///
20. liputtatissatther· ll sa ñgrī sume ///paṇḍit· ll sa ñgrī brahma ///
21. l· ll sa ñgrī brahmadiv· ll sa ñgri so /// ll sa ñgrī sañghasena varapaṇḍi-
22. t· ll thuiv· skhañ· ◇ tui°a· °am(ho) /// ha mañ· riy· son· °e°a· ll
23. thuiv· brī rakā thuiv· rājak /// y· mayā°a· °a sā thuiv· rhuy·
24. pu rhā thāpanā /// [°e°a·] /// hu /// s[o] kū plo°a· ◇ °e°a·
25. plo°a· bri ra(k) /// (°i)y· kū pu ◇ rhā lho(t·) /// · ///
26. sakmunalon· [t](ac)· rvoh· ll rapāy· (t) /// ll hen· buiv· ta
27. c· rvoh· ll °iy· [ky]on· [p/s]lī rvoh(·) yo ruy'· °e°a· ll thiv·
28. rājaku(mā)[r]· (maññ)· su pay· mayā°a· sā °iy· kū pu rhā °ā riy·
29. son ruy'· °e°a· °iy'· sei°a· min'· °e°a· ll °iy· ñā °amho°a·
30. kā sarvvaññutaññāṇ· praññjā ra °ap'· sū °akroñ· phlac· ◇ ciy'·
31. teh· ll noñ· °ā ña sā laññ· goñ· ll ña mliy· laññ· goña
32. ll ña °achuy· laññ· goñ· ll sū tac· thū laññ· goñ· ll °iy· pu rhā °ā ña
33. lhū kha su kyon· °anhip·°acak· teh· mū mu kā ll °arimittiryā pu
34. rhā skhañ· °a phū ra ◇ ciy ll 0 ll

3.7 The Old Mon text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Marc Miyake

1. [r]/// u(d)[dh]
2. ddha tirley· kuli °a /// moya lñima ///
3. ḃār· cvas· diññcām· cnām· tuy· ll ḃe /// ḃu
4. °arimaddanapur· vo°a· smiñ· śrītribhu ///

5. mmarāj· das· || gna kyek· smiñ· goḥ[h](·) ///
6. lokavaṭamsakā de ◇ vi °imo ///
7. kyek· goḥh· rājakumār· °imo ///
8. g(o)ḥh· kil· ḍik· pi tvāññ· ku gna Ce ///
9. g(o)ḥh· || kāl· gna kyek· goḥh· cu(t)
10. °a°ut· kiryā gna kyek· goḥ ku ḍik· pi ///
11. goḥh· smiñ· tun· keil· ku kon· gna ///
12. ma °imo°a· rāja[ku]mār· goḥh· || smi ///
13. kmin· ḅār cvas· diññcām· cnām· tuy· (k) ///
14. goḥ 'jey· ññan· scuti || kon· ///
15. ma °imo°a· rāja ◇ kumār· go ///
16. r·nas· guṇ· ma smiñ· °iññcim· jirk ///
17. kyak· thar· moy· °ār· tu(ḅ)ok· smi
18. ñ· munas· rov· vo°a· || kyek· thar· vo°a· °e
19. y· ḍik· pa raṃpo°a· tirla ḍi(k·) pi tvāññ· ma
20. tirla keil· ku °ey· goḥ /// °ey· ḍik·
21. kil· ku kyek· vo°a· tirla °anu
22. modanā da || kāl· goḥ smiñ· (sḍ)ik· gap puma
23. s· thic· °ā thic· °ā smiñ· pa sādhu(k)ār· || kāl·
24. goḥ tirla ◇ poy· mhāthe /// | ticār·
25. muggaliputtatissatther· || ◇ ticā /// [su]medhapa
26. ṇḍit· || ticār brah///pāl· || (ti) /// r· brahma
27. /// [va || ti]cār(·) son(·) || t(i)cā /// (ñgha)sena-
28. [var]paṇḍit· || kinta tir[l]a (t)a goḥ smiñ·
29. cut· ḍek· han· ti || blaḥ (go) /// (ko)n·
30. gna kyek· ma °imo°a· rājaku /// (go)ḥ
31. ket· kyek· thar· goḥh· thāpa?ā ka /// guo
32. h· cloñ· thar· vo°a· || kāl· busac·

33. kyeḁ· goḥ· vo°a· kon· gna kyeḁ g(o)ḥ
34. ket· sak·munalon· moy· tvāññ· /// pā
35. y· moy· tvāññāḥḥ· gir°uy· moy·
36. tvāññ· || 'ut· ḁik· pi tvāññ· goḥ cu
37. t· ḁek· ku kyeḁ· thar· ma thāpanā
38. hin· guoḥ vo°a· rādhanā rov· vo
39. °· || sinrañ· °ey· vo°a· °or· das· he
40. t· ku gvo°a· sarvvaññutaññāḥ· ||[] ko
41. n· °ey· laḥ || cov· °e°a· laḥ || kulo
42. °ey· laḥ || ññāḥ c'en· laḥ || yal· pa °u-
43. padrov· ku ḁik· ma °ey· kil· ku
44. kyeḁ· vo°a· yañ· ññir·ññāc· kye-
45. k· trey· mettey· laḥ °or· ḁeh·
46. go°a· || 0 ||

3.8 The Pali text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Marc Miyake

1. || śrī || buddhādikaṃ vatthuvaraṃ nametvā puññaṃ kataṃ yaṃ jina ///
2. kaṃ rājakumāraṇāmadhayaṇa vakkhāmi suṇ ///
3. nibbānā lokanāthassa °aṭṭhaviśā ḁ dhike gaCe /// sse pana
4. vassānaṃ chasate cāpare tathā || 0 || °arimadda /// smi pure °āsi
5. mahabbalo rājā tibhuvanādicco °udiccā /// va ḁ ṇsajo
6. tassāsekā piyā devī sā tilokava /// kā hitesī
7. kusalā sabbakiccesu pana rā[j]i[n]o || /// || (t) /// sāseko su
8. to rāja ḁ ku ḁ māro nāma nāmato °amacco rājakiccesu
9. byāvato satimā vidū || 0 || °adā gāmattayaṃ tassā de
10. ḁ viyā so mahīpati pasanno savvadā [dā]saparibhogena
11. bhuñjituṃ || 0 || °aniccatāvasaṃ tassā ga(t)āya pana deviyā

12. rāja rājakumārassa °adā gāmattayaṃ puna || 0 || °aṭhavīsati
13. vassāni rajjaṃ dhammena kāriya mā ◇ rananti(k)arogassa vasaṃ pa
14. tte narādhipe || 0 || saranto dhammarājassa (ma)hantaṃ guṇasañca
15. yaṃ kāretvā satthuno bi ◇ mbaṃ sabbasova[ṇṇa]yaṃ subhaṃ || 0 || ga
16. hetvā taṃ ◇ mahantena sakkārena sumānas[o] °upasaṅkamma
17. rājānaṃ °āha cintitam attano || 0 || bhāgaṃ katvānidaṃ satthu
18. bimbaṃ sovaṇṇayaṃ su ◇ bhaṃ °akāsiṃ vo varaṃ puññaṃ sā ◇ mi
19. tumhe numodatha || gāmattayaṃ pi vo sāmi pubbe dinna
20. n tu me °ahaṃ °imasseva munindassa demi taññ cānumodatha || 0
21. || ◇ °evaṃ vutte mahīpālo rogenāturamānaso sādhu sā
22. ti vatvāna tu ◇ ṭhahattho pamodito || 0 || dayāparo pa
23. hāthero hero ◇ muggaliputtako sumedhattā su
24. medho ti laddhanāmo ca ◇ paṇḍito || 0 || brahmapā
25. lo tathā brahmadevo sampannasīlavā sono bahu
26. ssuto saṅghasennaṃ varapaṇḍito || 0 || °etesāṃ
27. pana bhikkhūnaṃ saṃmukhā so sumānaso (ja)laṃ pātesi katvā
28. na sakkhin tu vasudhātalaṃ || 0 || tat(o) so taṃ mahāmacco
29. bim /// sovaṇ(ṇ)ayaṃ subhaṃ pati /// i /// (kāresi gu)
30. [ha] (ka) /// [vā na] maṅgalaṃ buddhapa ///
31. timāya gu ◇ hāya ca °akāsevaṃ paṇī ◇ dhānaṃ
32. nibbinno bhavaśaṅkate || 0 || karontena mayā °etaṃ
33. yaṃ puññaṃ taṃ samācitaṃ hotu sabbaññutaññāṇaṃ
34. pahivedhāya paccay[o] || 0 || yattakā tu mayā
35. dāsā gāmattayanivāsino dinnā gu ◇ hāya sova
36. /// patimāya mahesino || 0 || putto me vā pa
37. /// tt(o) vā °añño vā pana ññātako yo koci
38. pasaṅkappo nara °assaddhamānaso || 0 || ka[r]e
39. yyapadduvaṃ tesāṃ dāsānaṃ so narādhamo mittiyyadi

40. pa ◊ dinda ◊ ssa dassanaṃ nādhigacchatū ti || 0 ||

At the end of line 40 is the beginning of a barely visible text in Old Burmese that continues for two more lines. A reading of this text is forthcoming. This Old Burmese text is clearly not part of the original inscription, as it is not in the same hand as any of the other faces in Mon-Burmese script.

3.9 The Pyu text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths, Julian K. Wheatley, and Marc Miyake

1. 1 || siri || dathagaṃda ḃa doṃ ḃaṃḃ ḃiṃḃ pdum sgum damḃ ḃa tva 1000 [600]
2. 20 hra[t]-ṃ °o sni[n]-ḃ ḃiṃḃ tvaṃ-ṃṃḃ tha daṃ-ṃṃṃ yaṃ tim priṃ-ḃ rimadham-narbu °o miṃ-ḃ ḃiṃḃ si // sri tribhu-
3. vaṃnadit-ṃṃṃtya dham-maraja °o rmiṃ-ḃ ḃiṃḃ si // °o doṃ-ṃḃ ḃaZ ḃaṃḃ °o rvaṃ-ṃḃ mayaḃ triḃo-
4. gavadasaga demviṃ ḃiṃḃ si °o rmi // pau °o saḃ rajaguma ḃiṃḃ
5. si °o rmi // °o vaṃ traḃ kra nhoḃ ḃiṃḃ paṃḃ toḃZ // pau ḃaṃḃ mayaḃ ḃiṃḃ
6. hi ta-damṃ // ḃaṃḃ mayaḃ °o tra traḃ kra hoḃ ḃiṃḃ paṃḃ [t]ḃaḃ ḃaṃḃ mayaḃ
7. [°o saḃ rajaguma °o vaṃ] // pau ◊ ḃiṃḃ tdamḃ sniḃ rpu hraṃ ḃiṃḃ ta-damṃ // 0 //
8. ḃiṃḃ sriḃ ḃiṃḃ hniṃḃḃḃiṃḃ hi °o mtu dum roḃZ // pau ḃaṃḃ mayaḃ °o saḃ
9. rajaguma ḃiṃḃ si °o rmi // °o diṃṃ ḃiṃḃ mtau ma pau tdamḃ to °o kḃeḃtroḃ
10. diṃṃ ḃiṃḃ mdaum.haḃ.ḃaḃ damṃ // pau ḃaṃḃ ḃudha °o chaḃ.bo bradima tha [tlu] ḃiṃḃ se
11. kyaḃ // pau ḃaṃḃ budha ḃiṃḃ tuḃ thmuḃ ḃoḃ yaṃ naṃ ḃiṃḃ tdiṃḃ toḃZ // yaṃ
12. ḃudha tha ḃaṃḃ raḃ.saḃ ḃiṃḃ se ma buḃ ḃaṃḃ °o vaṃ paṃḃ che choḃZ // yaṃ traḃ
13. k[ra] nhoḃ ḃiṃḃ paṃḃ ma buḃ // yaṃ ḃaṃḃ hra tha °o vaṃ paṃḃ cheZ // pau ḃoḃ ḃaṃḃ
14. tdamḃ ḃiṃḃ kiṃ pa damṃ ḃiṃḃ na ha pra choḃ ha choḃ ḃiṃḃ si // pau °o
15. doṃḃ traḃ ḃaṃḃ mhaṃthe / traḃ ḃaṃḃ mugamṃtubudimsaṃthe / traḃ ḃaṃḃ
16. saumedhaḃadiṃṃ / traḃ ḃaṃḃ vrahmaba / traḃ ḃaṃḃ vrahmadamyoḃ / tra ḃaṃḃ
17. su / traḃ ḃaṃḃ sagamṃsirvamṃrabadiṃṃ / pau traḃ ḃaṃḃ sagha tvo °o hṃa.
18. diṃ dum tdamḃ tu ḃaṃḃ ḃiṃḃ cha toḃ tdum // pau ḃiṃḃ ta-damṃ mayaḃ °o saḃ
19. rajaguma ḃiṃḃ si °o rmi maZ // ḃiṃḃ staḃana ḃudha tha ḃiṃḃ se goṃ
20. °o stau tha ḃiṃḃ ta-damṃ // pau goṃ °o hḃi ḃiṃḃ samḃ ma roḃ // samana-

21. rđomñh kra tam // rabai kra tam / jimvuñ kra tam / yam trah kra hoñ diñm bñm
22. diñm damñ // yam bamñ mayah °o sah rajaguma yam gom bamñ budha
23. °o vam tdum bñm chai ta-damñ // yam na bñm diñm cho // yam ma gamñ pra buñ
24. saveñudeña b(r)e[ña] (b)i(mñ.b)i(mñ pamñ) ch(e) nah [t](i)m pda(mñ)h [pa] (//)
25. ya(m) [t]r[a] ? + + + + + [sa]h ða / gi pđi ða / gi (s)ruh
26. ða / mra.ja.[h]ña [ða /] ya(m) budha °o vam gamñ hđimñ toñ
27. ma diñm / ga hñim ci ga bro.pdam ma tah ñuh buñ // yam bamñ
28. budha °arimedeyam damñ bah kdim.kchimñ tim tmu ma pamñ
29. che choñZ ♦ || @

4 Phonology of the Pyu text

The phonology of the Kubyaukgyi text has characteristics distinguishing it from the phonology of all other Pyu texts in our corpus other than 39 whose Pyu and Old Mon texts refer to the year 441 = 1078 CE.

Shafer (1943: 316) was the first to suggest that the Kubyaukgyi text was in Late Pyu whereas earlier Pyu texts were in Old Pyu. Shafer differentiated between the two stages of Pyu on the basis of two criteria:

- Late Pyu had grammatical differences from Old Pyu
- Late Pyu had borrowings from Old Mon and Old Burmese absent from Old Pyu

Shafer (1943: 357) also speculated that "If we had more common lexical comparisons from the two periods, some phonetic change might perhaps be observed."

One phonetic change that has been observed in Miyake (forthcoming) is the fortition of Old Pyu *l to a Late Pyu retroflex ɖ, possibly via a retroflex ɭ in an intermediate stage Miyake called Middle Pyu. Retroflex ɖ is unique to the three Late Pyu texts (7, 8, 39), and retroflex ɭ is unique to 37, which Miyake tentatively regards as the only Middle Pyu text. 'Middle Pyu' is a shaky category since

- 37 cannot be dated; it may be contemporary with Old Pyu or New Pyu
- 37 is the only Pyu text found near modern Nay Pyi Taw, so its retroflex ɭ may reflect an unique dialectal development rather than an intermediate stage between Old and New Pyu

- ɭ only appears in three distinct akṣaras in 37: ɭo, ɭim, and ɭamñ. Out of these three akṣaras, only ɭamñ resembles a word with a meaning found in another text: Old Pyu ɭamñ (16.1b, 2b, 2C) > New Pyu pḍamñ (7.23, 8.24) 'base'. However, there is no guarantee that ɭamñ in 37 also means 'base'; it may be an unrelated word with a spelling other than ɭamñ elsewhere in the corpus.

l is still present in two Late Pyu akṣaras, tlu '?' (7.10 and 8.10) and pli 'grandson' (7.24) corresponding to pđi 'id.' (8.25).

tlu is unique to 7 and 8. It may be an archaic spelling for /t.du/ from an earlier ʔtlu not attested elsewhere in the corpus. It may also be a loanword postdating the fortition of l.

pli 'grandson' (7.24) is not a loanword. Although its spelling is identical to that of Old Pyu pli 'grandson' (16.4A), it may represent /p.ɖi/.

A more speculative phonetic change also observed in Miyake (forthcoming) is the fortition of Old Pyu *hl to a Late Pyu retroflex hḍ. hl is unique to Old Pyu, and hḍ is unique to Late Pyu. However, none of the three hḍ-words have clear ancestors in Old Pyu. There is no Old Pyu hli or hli corresponding to Late Pyu hḍi 'dedication formula', and Old Pyu hlimḥ '?' (16.3d and elsewhere) may or may not be the same word as either of the two Late Pyu hḍimḥ, 'to dedicate to' (7.25, 8.26) and '?' (7.7, 8.8).

The Late Pyu of the Kubyaukgyi inscription has the following initials:

Preinitials

	/k./		
			/r./
/s./	/t./	/n./	
	/p./	/m./	

Periods in phonological reconstructions separate preinitial consonants from initial consonants.

Simple initials

	/°/?	/h/									
	/k/			/g/		g-m /ḡ/	hñ /ḥ/	ñ /ṇ/			
	/c/	ch /cʰ/		j /j/		y-m /j/	hñ /ḥ/	(ñ /ṇ/)		/y /j/	
				ḍ /ḍ/	hḍ /D/				hr /ṛ/	/r/	dr /R/
/s/	/t/	th /tʰ/		/d/		d-m /ḏ/	hn /ṇ/	/n/		/l/	
	/p/	ph /pʰ/	ḃ /ḃ/	/b/		v-m /v/	hm /ṃ/	/m/		v /w/	

Complex initials

	/k./	/t./	/n./	/p./	/m./	/r./	/s./
/g/							sg-m /s.g/
/c/	kch /k.c/						
/ḍ/	kḍ /k.ḍ/			pḍ /p.ḍ/			
/t/					/m.t/		/s.t/
/d/	kd-m /k.d/	td-m /t.d/		pd-m /t.d/	md-m /m.d/		
/n/	/k.n/						/s.n/
/p/						rb /r.p/	
/ḃ/		tḃ /t.ḃ/					
/v/		tv-m /t.b/				rv-m /r.b/	
/m/		tm, thm /t.m/				/r.m/	
/j/	ky /k.j/						
/r/	/k.r/	/t.r/		/p.r/	/m.r/		/s.r/
/l/		/t.l/		/p.l/			
/w/		tv /t.w/					
/h/			/n.h/		/m.h/		

Aspiration is nonphonemic after preinitials. This may be a Late Pyu innovation.

Polysyllabic medial consonants

		/h/		g /k/	g-m, gh /g/			
					j, y-m /ipaɟ/		ñ/p/	y /j/
				ɖ /d/				/r/, rɖ /r.d/, rb /r.p/, rv-m /r.b/
/s/	t(y) /t(.y)/	/tʰ, th /tʰ/		d /t/	dh, d- m /d/		/n/	
			ɸ /b/	b /p/	bh, v- m /b/	hm /m/	/m/	v /w/

Voiceless stops lenite to voiced in intervocalic position in close juncture.

Voiced stops lenite to fricatives in intervocalic position in close juncture.

Pre-initials

	/k./		
			/r./
/s./	/t./	/n./	
	/p./	/m./	

There are seven vowels: /a ä i ī u e o/.

/ä/ is a low front vowel spelled *am̃*.

/ī/ is a nonfront, nonlow vowel spelled *im̃*.

A has no subscript consonant symbols for codas, and B only has a few such symbols. Hence it is often not possible to tell whether written open syllables in fact represented open syllables. There are two types of potential unwritten codas: voiceless sonorant codas and all other codas. I phonologize the first type as /(C)h/ and the second type as /(C)/: e.g.,

- *kyah* /k.jah/ may have been /k.jaɰ̃/, /k.jaɰ̃/, etc. as well as /k.jah/

- *hḍī* /Di(C)/ may have been /Dik/, /Diɰ̃/, etc. as well as /Di/.

I do not reconstruct (C) if a syllable in a word appears as an open syllable in texts with subscript consonants or if it corresponds to an open syllable in another language.

The only codas that can be confirmed from spellings in B are -ṇ-ḥ /ṇ̃/, -ṇ- /ṇ/, -t- /t/, -m- /m/, -ḥ /h/. Others are supplied on the basis of the Kan Wet Khaung Mound inscription (PYU 16).

It is possible that /h/ and voiceless sonorant codas conditioned tones by the Late Pyu period, but that is impossible to determine from spellings alone. Hence I phonemicize Late Pyu with codas in lieu of tones.

5 Grammar of the Pyu text: a few preliminary notes

The Kubyaukgyi inscription is invaluable for the reconstruction of Pyu grammar because it is the only multilingual text which is largely intact and contains coherent prose. The Kan Wet Khaung Mound inscription (PYU 16) is largely intact, but its Pyu content consists of glosses, not connected sentences. Conversely, the various texts of the Myittha inscription (PYU 39) are all heavily damaged to some degree; there is almost no Sanskrit text left. Both sides of the Pyu-Chinese Tharaba Gate inscription (PYU 11) are worn to the point of near-total illegibility.

The writing conventions of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi inscription both help and hinder the reconstruction of its grammar. On the one hand, *daṇḍa* (Sanskrit: 'stick') punctuation marks break up the text. Double *daṇḍas* appear roughly where full stops would be expected, and single *daṇḍas* appear roughly where commas would be expected. For instance, the first sentence of the Old Burmese text (7.1-3) ends in double *daṇḍas*, and a similarly long stretch of Pyu text (A1/B1-A2/B2) also ends in double *daṇḍas*.

The reconstruction of the grammar of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi inscription is dependent upon the correct identification of morphemes. I can tentatively classify what appear to be free morphemes as 'words', but I am unable to be certain whether grammatical morphemes are bound affixes or clitics. Hence I use the deliberately vague term 'marker' for grammatical morphemes. I use periods to join sequences of syllables which may constitute a phrase (i.e., a sequence of words) or a polysyllabic word of one or more morphemes.

I assume that Indic nouns in the other three texts of the Kubyaukgyi correspond to nouns in Pyu: e.g., the Pali noun *rājakumāra* 'Rajakumara' and its Old Burmese and Old Mon equivalent *rājakumār* correspond to a Pyu noun *rajaguma*. The phonetic resemblance of such polysyllabic sequences cannot be due to chance. As there is no guarantee that a borrowed word will retain its original part of speech. Nonetheless a retention of noun status is the norm in contact situations, and we have no positional evidence to suggest that these Indic loans were verbs.

The identification of non-Indic Pyu nouns in the Kubyaukgyi on the basis of correlations with other texts and potential Trans-Himalayan cognates is less secure than equating obvious Indic loans. Once again, there is no guarantee that a Pyu word has the same part of speech as its equivalent in other texts. The possibility of a Pyu word being inherited from Proto-Trans-Himalayan or some lower-level proto-language does not improve the odds of stability in any way. Still, the positional evidence indicates that these non-Indic words were nouns.

What exactly is this positional evidence? If Pyu had a strict word order, I could expect Pyu nouns to appear only in certain slots. And if Pyu were inflecting, I could expect Pyu nouns to have certain affixes. Unfortunately, Pyu seems to be almost entirely lacking in inflectional morphology apart from the first person pronoun *gaṃḥ* /gǎj/ which has a genitive form *gi* /gi/.

6 Glossary of the Pyu text

Entries appear in an alphabetic order based on that of Burmese with the addition of *ḥ* after *b*:

<i>k</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>gh</i>	<i>ṇ</i>		
<i>c</i>	<i>ch</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>jh</i>	<i>ṇ̃</i>		
<i>ṭ</i>	<i>ṭh</i>	<i>ḍ</i>	<i>ḍh</i>	<i>ṇ̣</i>		
<i>t</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>dh</i>	<i>n</i>		
<i>p</i>	<i>ph</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>ḥ</i>	<i>bh</i>	<i>m</i>	
<i>y</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>l</i>	<i>v</i>			
<i>s</i>	<i>h</i>	°				
<i>a</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>ai</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>au</i>
<i>ṃ</i>	<i>ṁ</i>	<i>ḥ</i>				

I do not include Z in the forms in my lexicon since I do not regard it as an inherent part of any word.

I choose spellings of Indic loanwords closest to their sources for main entries to facilitate lookup by users familiar with Indic languages. Similarly, I choose maximally conservative spellings of

non-Indic Pyu words for main entries to facilitate lookup by users familiar with Trans-Himalayan languages. I favor A spellings and/or more frequent spellings if I have no way to determine whether a spelling is more conservative. Nonfavored spellings have stub entries with cross-references to main entries.

I combine variant spellings into single entries. If multiple spellings are of equal frequency, I assign stub entries to spellings that appear incomplete or damaged. Otherwise I assign stub entries to arbitrarily chosen spellings. Variant spellings are listed in parentheses following their citation: e.g., B14 (*kin pa*) in the entry for *kin pha*.

Forms in slashes are phonological reconstructions. Spaces separate syllables and do not necessarily correspond to morphemic boundaries.

Citations from the two versions of the Kubyaukgyi inscription are in the format A or B plus line number. Each attestation in A is followed by a slash and its counterpart in B: e.g., A13/B14 indicates that a word in A13 corresponds to a word in B14. If a word appears in only one version, a hyphen indicates its absence in the other: e.g.,

A24/B-

A-/B6

This format allows users to easily compare words in the same contexts in both versions.

Numbers followed by x in parentheses indicate multiple attestations of a pairing: e.g., A8/B9 (×2) indicates two instances of a word in A8 corresponding to two instances of a word in B9. A8/B9 (×2) does not mean that there are only two instances of a word in A8 and B9; the word in question (°o) in fact appears three times in both A8 and B9, but the third instances in A8 and B9 are in different pairings: A8/B8 and A9/B9.

Non-Kubyaukgyi citations are in the format PYU inventory number + period + line number. Letters following the line number (A, b, C, d) specify the four faces of 16.

The Pali text only loosely corresponds to the Pyu text. I have tended to cite Pali equivalents only when they correspond to Pyu words lacking equivalents in OB and OM.

All readings are regularized for ease of comparison unless indicated otherwise: e.g., I write "first two syllables of *kdiṃ kchirṇ tiṃ*" at the beginning of Tha Myat's gloss even though Tha Myat himself read those syllables as *diṃ chirṇ* or *textitdiṃ kchi*.

I do not provide other scholars' readings unless they are relevant for a phonological discussion. Those other readings are preceded by abbreviations from the apparatus: e.g., Tm *diṃ chirṇ* is Tha Myat's reading of *kdiṃ kchirṇ*.

Other scholars' glosses are direct quotations despite the absence of double quotation marks. I have made small, nonsubstantive changes in capitalization and punctuation for stylistic consistency with the rest of this article: e.g., double quotes for glosses have been converted to single quotes for glosses, and punctuation has been placed outside single quotes. I have also added 'to' or 'to be' whenever they are absent from glosses of verbs.

All Blagden glosses are from Blagden [1919b] except for those followed by (1911) in parentheses; the latter are from Blagden [1911] whenever they differ from those of Blagden [1919b].

I include line numbers in glosses when scholars provide different glosses for the same entry in different contexts.

I have translated Tha Myat and Katō's glosses into English following their glosses which are respectively in Burmese and Japanese.

I reproduce Tha Myat's idiosyncratic Burmese spellings with redundant creaky and high tone marking verbatim: e.g., ရှိ and ညှဉ်းဆဲး instead of standard ရှိ and ညှဉ်းဆဲ. Although Burmese has no infinitives, I translate the suffixes လွန်သည် and မိန့်၏ in Tha Myat's glosses of verbs as 'to'

Glosses extracted from idiomatic translations are included and marked with (IT) if there is no word-for-word gloss or if they substantially differ from word-for-word glosses.

In the notes, I use the term HL (hapax legomenon) to refer to words which are unique to the A and/or B versions of the Kubyaukgyi inscription. Although strictly speaking a word that appears in both versions is not a hapax legomenon, two attestations in two versions of the same text are not the same thing as two attestations in two completely different texts.

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: first two syllables of Tm *dim̐ chim̐ tim̐* or *dim̐ kchi ti* မြင်ခင်း 'sight', ဖူးမြင်ခင်း 'beholding with admiration', a borrowing from Sanskrit *dr̥ṣṭi* 'sight'

Katō: (၇၇) causative) + (၇၇) 'to meet'

Krech: sight

Jenny: sight (?) + to get

Notes: HL. This expression is probably not an object-verb sequence 'sight get' since it is negated by a preceding *baḥ*. I would expect a verb to be negated ('not get-sight') rather than its object ('get not-sight'). *kdim̐ kchim̐* may be a disyllabic verb. Its alliteration suggests that it may be a partly reduplicative expression. A verb with a specific meaning like 'to get the sight of' is likely to be a HL in a small corpus, whereas a verb with a more generic meaning like 'to get' should be a common verb that is not an HL. *kchim̐* is probably not 'to get' or 'to meet' because it is an HL. *kdim̐*, on the other hand, occurs 14 times in the corpus, suggesting that it is a common verb like 'to meet' possibly followed by a rare synonym chosen for alliteration. But it is unclear whether the other instances of *kdim̐* are of the same word.

knam̐h /k.nät/ /k.näh/

A24/B-

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: future

Blagden: future time (?)

Shafer: to press?, to oppress?

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: first syllable of Tm *kum̐h dūm̐* ကုံအံ့ 'will be sufficient'

Katō: (၇၇၇၇) 'to plan'

Krech: village

Notes: /t/ on basis of 16.1b *knat-m̐h*

kyah̐ /k.ja(C)h/

A10/B11

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: causative

Gloss: causative marker

Blagden: to cause

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: to cause

Tha Myat: ကာ 'while ...-ing'; ရှိ 'after ...-ing'; လျက် 'while ...-ing'

Katō: (၇၇) exclamation)

Krech: emphatic

kra /k.ra(C)/

A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B13, A20/B21 (×2), A21/B21 (×2)

OB: *rvoh*·

OM: *tvāññ*·

Gloss: village

Blagden: village

Shafer: village

Than Tun: village

Tha Myat: ရွာ 'village'

Katō: ရွာ 'village'

Krech: village

ga /ga(C)/

A25 (×2), B27 (×2)

OB: no equivalent

OM: yal·

Gloss: if

Blagden: possibly a particle meaning 'if'

Shafer: if (?)

Than Tun: if ('it' for the second instance is a typo for 'if')

Tha Myat: ဘာ: 'as for'

Katō: ဘာ 'if'

Krech: first instance: grammatical morpheme; second instance: second syllable of *chi ga* 'to be afraid'

gamh /gǎj̥/

A23/B23, A25/B26

OB: *nā*

OM: °ey·

Gloss: I or royal 'we'

Blagden: I

Shafer: I

Than Tun: I

Tha Myat: ငါ 'I'

Katō: A23: ငါ 'virtue'; A25: first syllable of *gamh hdimh* ငါ့ 'offering'

Krech: A23: second syllable of *ma gamh* 'deed'; A25: anterior event marker

gi /gi/

A24/B-, A24/B25 (×2)

OB: *nā*

OM: °ey·

Gloss: my or royal 'our'

Blagden: my

Shafer: my

Than Tun: my

Tha Myat: ငါ့ 'my', ငါ 'my'

Katō: ငါ့ 'my'

Krech: first person pronoun

gom /go/

A19/B19, A20/B20, A22/B22

OB: *kū*

OM: *guoh· goh*

Pali: *guhā*

Gloss: cave-pagoda

nā /ŋa(C)/

A14, B14

OB: *min·* 'to speak'

OM: *p·sādhukār·* 'to express approval'

Gloss: to exclaim

Blagden: to exclaim (?)

Shafer: to exclaim

Than Tun: no gloss; to exclaim (IT)

Tha Myat: လျက် 'while ...-ing', ရှိ၍ 'after ...-ing', ကာလ 'while ...-ing'

Katō: နှိုး 'to exclaim'

Krech: to utter

nūh /ŋu(C)h/

A25/B27

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: °*assaddhamānaso*?

Gloss: to be unbelieving?

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: to exclaim

Tha Myat: ရယ်ပြုံးလျက် 'while laughing and smiling'

Katō: no gloss

Krech: to be skilled in

ce /ce(C)/

A12/B12, A13/B13, A23/B24, A26/B29 (*che* in all instances except for A12)

OB: A12/B12: no equivalent, A13/B13: *ye°a·?*, A23/B24: °*am*·, A23/B24, A26/B29: *ciy*·?

OM: A12/B12, A13/B13: no equivalent, A23/B24, A26/B29: °*or*·.

Gloss: irrealis marker

Blagden: probably a particle, or a verbal auxiliary to the verb /textitpamḥ; cf. Early Burmese /textitciy·?

Shafer: present time

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: ကြိယထောက်ပံ့စွဲ: 'verb support particle'

Krech: to let

Jenny: A26/B29: present

Notes: Yabu: *masu yō ni*

cha

See *chai*.

chah.bo /c^ha(C)h bo(C)/

A10/B10

OB: °*achan*·

OM: *kyek*· 'sacred thing'

Gloss: form, likeness

Blagden: likeness (?) + a image, representation, likeness (?)

Shafer: likeness + form

Than Tun: likeness + image

Tha Myat: အဆင်း 'appearance' + ပုံ 'form', သဏ္ဌာန် 'form'

Krech: likeness + form

Katō: ပုံ 'form'

Notes: Following Katō, I regard *chaḥ.bo* as a single word. It may consist of two morphemes and may even be a compound of two free morphemes, but there is no independent evidence confirming either possibility, so I tentatively treat it as a single unit describing how 'Buddha' relates to 'image'. *chaḥ.bo* may also be forming a synonym compound with the Sanskrit loan *bradima* 'image'.

Both syllables of *chaḥ.bo* are HL.

If *bo* is a morpheme and if its *b* is the result of voicing in close juncture, its base form may be /po(C)/ with or without a final consonant that was not written in the Kubyaukgyi. However, no akṣara like *po* is in the corpus.

Blagden's division into two morphemes may be rooted in his comparison of *chaḥ* to Old Burmese °*achan̄*· and his more tentative comparison of *bo* to Burmese *purī*. These comparisons are plausible but cannot be confirmed because the only extant spelling lacks subscript consonant symbols and the expected Pyu forms with final consonants (†*chan̄-h̄* and †*bom̄*·) are absent from the corpus.

It is not clear whether Shafer, Than Tun, and Krech had independent grounds for agreeing with Blagden's division.

che

See *ce*.

chai /c^haj/

A18 (*cha*)/B18 (*cha*), A22/B23

OB: *son̄*·

OM: *cut̄*·

Gloss: to pour

Blagden: A18: to pour; A22: to pour out

Shafer: A18: to pour; A22: *cha* to pour + *i* out

Than Tun: to pour

Tha Myat: A18: ချသည့် 'to drop (v.t.)'; A22: ချ၏ 'pour.RLS'

Katō: A18: ချ 'to pour'; A22: *cha* ချ 'to pour' + *y* (ချ benefactive)

Krech: to drop

cho /c^ho(C)/

A22/B23

OB: no equivalent or *min̄*· 'to speak'?

OM: *rāḍhanā* 'to pray'

Gloss: quotative marker or second syllable of *diṃṃ.cho*, a verb of speaking?

Blagden: possibly a variant of *choḥ*

Shafer: aspiration

Than Tun: to pour

Tha Myat: second syllable of *diṃṃ cho* မိန့်ဆို၏ 'command.say.RLS'

Katō: (ချ) exclamation

Krech: grammatical morpheme

Notes: cf. Written Burmese *chui* 'to speak'

choḥ /c^ho(C)h/

A12/B12, A14/B14 (×2), A26/B29

OB: *lhen̄*·. *teh̄*·, no equivalent elsewhere

OM: A14/B14 °*ā*, no equivalent elsewhere

Gloss: exclamatory marker

Blagden: apparently a final particle

Shafer: exclamatory particle

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: relative marker မေတ္တ

Katō: (ꣳꣳꣳ exclamation)

Krech: grammatical morpheme

Jenny: A26/B29: optative?

jīṁvuh /jī wuh/

A20/B21

OB: *hen·buiv·*

OM: *ññahh·gir°uy·*

Pali: absent

Gloss: name of a village

Notes: The Pyu, OB, and OM names are exonyms for an unknown original.

ḍa

See *la*.

ḍoh /ḍo(C)h/

A11/B11, A13/B13

OB: no equivalent

OM: A11/B11: no equivalent; A13/B13: *kāl·* 'time'

Gloss: locative-temporal marker

Blagden: it seems to be a postposition 'in', 'on'

Shafer: into, to, upon

Than Tun: in

Tha Myat: အခါ 'time'

Katō: ဘယ်ဘယ် 'while'

Krech: time

Notes: cf. OB *rhov·* 'time'

ta /ta/

A2 (*tha*)/B2 (*tha*), A5/B6, A7/B7, A18/B18, A20/B20, A22/B23

OB: A2/B2: *brī*; A5/B6: *kha*; A7/B7, A18/B18: *bri*; A20/B20 *plō°a· °e°a·*; A22/B23: *°e°a·*

OM: OM: A2/B2, A7/B7: *tuy·*; elsewhere no equivalent

Gloss: to place; first syllable of perfective marker *ta-damṁ*

Blagden: first syllable of a verb or auxiliary *tha dan·ṁm* indicating the past; probably the original meaning was 'to end', 'to finish'

Shafer: A2: perfect?; elsewhere: perfect

Than Tun: A2: first syllable of 'to end'

Tha Myat: A2/B2: first syllable of *tha dan·ṁm* ထိုအခါ 'that time'; elsewhere: first syllable of *ta dan·ṁm* ထိုအချိန် 'that time', ထိုနောက် 'after that', ရကား 'because'.

Katō: ဘဲဘဲ 'to end'

Krech: grammatical morpheme

Notes: Unaware of the subscript consonant *ṁ* in B2, Tha Myat derived *tha dan·ṁm* from Pali *tadā* 'at that time'. I reject his etymology for three reasons. First, Pali *t* would not be borrowed as Pyu *th*. Second, the Pyu front vowel *aṁ* /ä/ does not appear in Indic loans. Third, a Pali open syllable would not be borrowed with a final *ṁ*. Although *th* may be a sandhi variant of *t* after the *h* of the preceding *tvaṁ·ṁmḥ*, the other two objections cannot be explained away. The objection involving the vowel *aṁ* applies to the more common spelling *ta damṁ*, and the objection involving the coda *ṁ* may apply to *ta damṁ* if that spelling represents /ta ḍäj/.

An object of *ta* may have been accidentally omitted from A20/B20. This object may have been *gom* 'cave-pagoda' corresponding to OB *kū* 'cave-pagoda'.

tañ /täk/

A20/B21, A20/B21, A21/B21

OB: *tac*.

OM: *moy*.

Gloss: one

Blagden: one

Shafer: one

Than Tun: one

Tha Myat: တစ် 'one'

Katō: 一 'one'

Krech: one

tah /ta(C)h/

A25/B27

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *pāpasamkappo*

Gloss: to have evil thoughts?

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: (အဟန့်)တား '(stopping) to stop', ဆီး 'to obstruct', ကာ(ကွယ်) 'to shield', မြစ် 'to prohibit', တား ဆီး 'to obstruct', တား မြစ် 'to prohibit'

Katō: 起 'to rise'

Krech: to know

tiñ /ti/

A2/B2, A23/B24, A24/B-, A26/B28

OB: A2/B2: *nhik*. °ā; elsewhere no equivalent

OM: A2/B2: *de[y-]*; elsewhere no equivalent

Gloss: locative marker

Blagden: apparently a particle of relation, corresponding sometimes to our preposition 'in'

Shafer: (prep.) in, for, on (a certain day)

Than Tun: in

Tha Myat: A2/B2, A23/B24, A24/B-: တိုင်း 'country'; A26/B28: third syllable of *kdiñ kchimiñ* *tiñ* မြင်ခြင်း 'sight', ဖူးမြင်ခြင်း 'beholding with admiration', a borrowing from Sanskrit *dṛṣṭi* 'sight'

Katō: A2: 何 'at'; A23: no gloss; A24: 何 'to'; A26: 何何何何 'located in'

Krech: locative

Jenny: A26/B28: locative

tu /tu(C)/

A18/B18

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *sumānaso*

Gloss: joyful

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: well pleased?

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: second syllable of *tdamḥ tu ḥamḥ* မြတ်သောမင်းကြီး 'great noble king'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'was happy'

Krech: great

Notes: Shafer 333; Tha Myat *tat-dabon*· 'Duttabaung'

tuh /tuh/

A10/B11

OB: *nhap-liy*· 'to offer'

OM: *tu(ḥ)ok*· 'to offer'

Gloss: to bring

Blagden: to bring

Shafer: to bring

Than Tun: to bring

Tha Myat: အပ်နှံသည် 'to deliver', အပ်သည် 'to deliver'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'to insert'

Krech: to offer/behold

to /to(C)/

A9/B9

OB: *grī* 'great'

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *dhamma*-

Gloss: righteous

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: great (?), just (?)

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: (လေးစားမှုစကား)တော်ဟုယာယီယူဆပါ၏ (honorific) temporarily assumed to be *tau* 'royal'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'eminent'

Krech: great

Notes: The postnominal position suggests this word is an adjective modifying *tdamḥ* 'king'.

toh /to(C)h/

A5/B5, A11/B11, A18/B18, A25/B26

OB: A25/B26: *kha*; elsewhere °e°a·

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: perfective marker?

Blagden: a particle used after verbs; cf. Early Burmese *tum*

Shafer: terminal particle denoting end of one subject and change in the narration to another

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: ကြိယာထောက်ပံ့စွဲ: 'verb support particle'

Katō: A5, A11, A18: (𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 predication); A25: (𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 honorific?)

Krech: grammatical morpheme

tdamḥ /t.däṃ/

A7/B7, A9/B9, A13/B14, A17/B18

OB: *man*·

OM: *smin*·

Gloss: king

Blagden: king

Shafer: king

Than Tun: king

Tha Myat: မင်း 'king'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'king'

Krech: lord

tdimh /t.di(C)h/

A11/B11

OB: *min*· 'to speak'

OM: *munas*· 'to inform'

Gloss: to speak

Blagden: to say, to speak

Shafer: to speak

Than Tun: to say

Tha Myat: မိန့်၏ 'to command', ဆို၏ 'to say', မိန့်ဆို၏ 'to command'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'to say'

Krech: directive-say

Notes: Does Krech's gloss imply that *mtu* is an inflected form?

tdum /t.du(C)/

A18/B18, A22/B23

OB: *riy*·

OM: *dek*·

Gloss: water

Blagden: water

Shafer: water

Than Tun: water

Tha Myat: no gloss

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'water'

Krech: water

tbah /t.ba(C)h/

A6/B6

OB: *tun*

OM: *tun*· 'to return'

Gloss: postverbal marker of repeated action

Blagden: apparently an auxiliary going with *pamh*

Shafer: again

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: recurring action suffix ဝံ

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'again'

Krech: grammatical morpheme

tmu /t.mu/

A26/B28

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: presence?

OB: *trilokavataṃsakā*

OM: *trilokavaṭaṃsakā*

Pali: *tilokavaṭaṃsikā*

Gloss: Trilokavaṭaṃsakā

tlu /t.lu(C)/

A10/B10

OB: °*ati* 'all'

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: entirely

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: all, entirely, only of

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: ထုသည် 'to sculpt', ထုလုပ်သည် 'to sculpt and make', ပြုလုပ်သည် 'to make'

Katō: 𑜋𑜧𑜨𑜃𑜫 'genuine'

Krech: plural/all

tva /t.wa/

A1/B1

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: temporal marker

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: second syllable of *ba tva* ရောက်၍ 'after reaching'

Katō: 𑜋𑜧𑜨𑜃𑜫 'to count'

Krech: third syllable of '1628'

Notes: Also in 16 which enables me to guess it's a temporal marker.

tvañ·ṇm̐h /t.bäñ/

A2 (*tvañm̐h*)/B2

OB: *lon·*

OM: *tuy·*

Gloss: to elapse

Blagden: to elapse, to pass

Shafer: to elapse (of time)

Than Tun: to elapse

Tha Myat: လွန်သည် 'to exceed'

Katō: 𑜋𑜧𑜨𑜃𑜫 'to pass'

Krech: to elapse

tvañm̐h

See *tvañ·ṇm̐h*.

tvo /t.wo(C)/

A17/B17

OB: plural marker *tui°a·*

OM: plural marker *ta*

Pali: genitive plural marker *-naṃ*

Gloss: plural marker

Blagden: probably a particle indicating the plural; cf. Early Burmese *tui*?

Shafer: mendicant monks (?), beggars (?)

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: plural marker ဝံ

Katō: final syllable of *sagha tvo* 𑜋𑜃𑜫 'monks'

Krech: plural/all

tha¹ /t^ha(C)/

A10/B10, A11/B12, A13/B13, A19/B19, A19/B20

OB: *rhuy*·

OM: *thar*·

Gloss: golden

Blagden: gold, golden

Shafer: golden

Than Tun: gold

Tha Myat: ၈၅ 'gold'

Katō: 𑜋 'gold'

Krech: gold

Notes: /(C)/ is likely to have been /r/.

tha²

See *ta*.

thmuh /t.mu(C)h/

A11/B11

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: presence?

Blagden: presence (?)

Shafer: presence (?)

Than Tun: presence (?)

Tha Myat: 𑜋𑜃𑜫 'in the presence of'

Katō: 𑜋 'life'

Krech: directive-goal

dan-ṃṃ /dän/

A2/B2, A5/B6, A7/B7, A9/B10, A14/B14, A18/B18, A20/B20, A21/B22, A22/B23, A26/B28

(*danṃṃ* in all instances except B2)

OB: A2/B2, A5/B6, A9/B10, A14/B14, A18/B18: *rakā*; A7/B7, A21/B22, A22/B23: *ruy*'[·]
°e°a·; A20/B20: °e°a·; A26/B28: no equivalent

OM: A2/B2, A7/B7: *tuy*; elsewhere no equivalent

Gloss: A26/B28: grammatical marker?; elsewhere perfective?

Blagden: probably = *tha dan-ṃṃ*

Shafer: prioritive

Than Tun: to end

Tha Myat: A9/B10: second syllable of *ḍaḥ danṃṃ* 𑜋𑜃𑜫 'at that time', 𑜋𑜃𑜫: 'because';

A26/B28: second syllable of *danṃṃ ḥaḥ* 𑜋𑜃𑜫: 'beside'; elsewhere second syllable of *ta dan-ṃṃ* 𑜋𑜃𑜫 'that time', 𑜋𑜃𑜫 'after that', 𑜋𑜃𑜫: 'because'.

Katō: 𑜋𑜃𑜫 ... 'and ...'; A26: ?

Krech: A26: first syllable of *danṃṃ ḥaḥ* 'deva'; elsewhere: grammatical morpheme

Jenny: A26/B28: first syllable of *danṃṃ ḥaḥ* 'excellent (?)'

See *ḍaḥ* for commentary on Tha Myat's interpretation of *daṃṃ* in A9/B10.

daṃṃ

See *daṇṇi*.

dathagaṃda /ta t^ha ga ta/

A1/B1

OB: *purhā*

OM: *buddha*

Pali: *buddha*- 'buddha-'

Gloss: Tathāgata

diṃṃ¹ /dī(C)/

A8/B9, A9/B10, A21/B21, A25/B27

OB: A25/B27: °ā; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: A25/B27: *ku*; no equivalent elsewhere

Gloss: accusative marker

Blagden: A8: °o *diṃṃ* no gloss; A9, A25: no gloss

Shafer: A8, A9, A21, A25: passive?

Than Tun: A8: myself; A9, A21, A25: no gloss

Tha Myat: A8/B9: °o *diṃṃ* မိမိကို 'myself.ACC'; A9/B10 ပေးပြီ 'give and', ယူပြီ 'take and', ပြုခဲ့ပြီ 'did and'; A21/B21: first syllable of *diṃṃ ḥimḥ diṃṃ daṃṃ* ယူပြီးပေးပြီ 'take and give and', ယူရေ့၏ 'take and'; A25/B27: ပြုခဲ့ 'done'

Katō: A8, A9, A21 (first instance): first syllable of *diṃṃ ḥimḥ* (𑀢𑀺𑀓 honorific); A25: 𑀢𑀺𑀓 also

Krech: A8, A9, A21 (first instance), A25: serf

diṃṃ² /dī(C)/

A21/B22

OB: *yo* 'to bring'

OM: *ket* 'to take'

Gloss: to bring, take, or assemble?

Blagden: it may mean 'to assemble', 'to bring together'

Shafer: to assemble? to put or take out?

Than Tun: to assemble

Tha Myat: third syllable of *diṃṃ ḥimḥ diṃṃ daṃṃ* ယူပြီးပေးပြီ 'take and give and', ယူရေ့၏ 'take and'

Katō: 𑀢𑀺𑀓 'to collect'

Krech: to call

diṃṃ³ /dī(C)/

A22/B23

OB: *min* 'to speak'

OM: *rādhana* 'to pray'

Gloss: to pray?

Blagden: to pray

Shafer: assemble? put or take out?

Than Tun: to pray

Tha Myat: A22/B23: first syllable of *diṃṃ cho* မိန့်ဆို၏ 'to command'

Katō: 𑀢𑀺 'to say'

Krech: to say

duṃ /du/

A7/B8, A17/B18, A24/B-

OB: *nhik*; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: locative-temporal marker

Blagden: apparently a particle of relation. It seems to correspond roughly with our preposition 'in'.

Shafer: down? down onto?

Than Tun: A7: unto; A17: third syllable of *h̃na d̃im d̃um* which appears to mean 'in the presence (of)'; A24: in

Tha Myat: A7: လှ "; A17: locative markers တွ, ဌ, မှ, ဝယ်; A24: second syllable of *kñam̃h̃ d̃um* ကုံအံ့ 'will be sufficient'

Katō: A7: 𑀧𑀺𑀧𑀺 'like'; A17: (𑀧𑀺?) topic; A24: 𑀧𑀺 'if'

Krech: A7, A17: that; A24: plural/all

deṃviṃ /de vi/

A4/B4

OB: *devī*

OM: *devī*

Pali: *devi*

Gloss: queen

doṇ·ṃh̃ /doṇ̃/

A3 (*doṃh̃*)

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *piyā*

Gloss: to love or beloved?

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: benevolent, compassionate

Than Tun: second syllable of °o *doṃh̃* 'thereupon'

Tha Myat: first syllable of *doṇ·ṃh̃ ḍaZ ḥam̃h̃* မြတ်သောမင်းကြီး 'great noble king'

Katō: 𑀧𑀺𑀧𑀺 'eminent'

Krech: time

Notes: Tha Myat *tat-daboñ* 'Duttabaung'. Katō has the same gloss for *doṃ*.

doṃh̃ /do(C)h̃/

A14/B15

OB: no question

OM: *kāl*· 'time'

Gloss: a time noun; after?

Blagden: possibly a variant of *dum*; *pau* °o *doṃh̃* seems to mean 'thereupon'

Shafer: benevolent, compassionate

Than Tun: thereupon

Tha Myat: third syllable of *pau* °o *doṃh̃* ထိုအခါ 'at that time'

Katō: 𑀧𑀺𑀧𑀺 'eminent'

Krech: time

Notes: Katō has the same gloss for *doṃ*.

doṃ /do/

A1/B1

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *-bānā*

Gloss: to blow?

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: second syllable of *pad* 'nirvana'

Katō: *ṭṭṭ* 'eminent'

Krech: second syllable of *ba dom* 'Buddhist teachings'

Notes: Tha Myat was the first to identify *dom* as the second syllable of 'nirvana'. However, he regarded *ba dom* as a borrowing of Pali *pado* 'foot.NOM.SG' rather than as a calque of Sanskrit *nir-vāṇa*-/Pali *nib-bāna*-, both 'out-blow'.

Katō has the same gloss for *doṇ-mḥ*.

domḥ

See *doṇ-mḥ*.

dra /t.ra/

A6/B6 (*tra*)

OB: *tan-chā* 'ornaments'

OM: *kiryā* 'personal items'

Gloss: personal items

Blagden: goods, ornaments

Shafer: goods, ornaments

Than Tun: *°o dra* goods

Tha Myat: ပိုင်ဆိုင်သောပစ္စည်း: 'things that are possessed', ကုန်စည် 'goods', စီးပွားဥစ္စာ 'property',
ငွေ 'silver', တန်ဆာ (*sic*) 'ornament'

Katō: *ṭṭ* 'property'

Krech: valuable(s)

dhama-maraṇa /dam ma ra ja/

A3 (*dhama-maraṇa*)/B3

OB: *dhama-maraṇa*

OM: *dhama-maraṇa*

Pali: *dhama-maraṇa*

Gloss: righteous king

na /na(C)/

A11/B11 (*nam*), A22/B23

OB: *si°a*

OM: *rov*

Gloss: manner

Blagden: manner; *nam na* seems to mean 'thus', 'as follows'

Shafer: manner; (postpos.) like (?)

Than Tun: second syllable of *nam na* 'thus'

Tha Myat: နည်းနာ 'manner'

Katō: *ṭṭ* 'method'

Krech: second syllable of *nam na* this manner

Notes: The anusvāra of *naṁ* in B11 may be an accidental carryover from the anusvāra of the preceding *yaṁ*. The word is spelled *na* in all three other instances. The accidental addition of a single anusvāra is more likely than the accidental omission of an anusvāra in three out of four spellings. *yaṁ na* also appears in 93, but *yaṁ naṁ* is a HL in B11, so *yaṁ na* is likely to be the correct spelling.

Tha Myat: < Pali *naya* improbable; prob neither cognate or loan; Pyu cognate of *naññ* should be **niñ*; WB -*ññ* absent in Pyu

naṁ

See *na*.

naḥ /na(C)h/

A23/B24

OB: no equivalent

OM: *het*.

Gloss: cause

Blagden: Somewhere in the phrase beginning with this word the idea of 'cause' must be expressed.

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: နည်းနာ 'manner'

Katō: no gloss

Krech: manner

nhoh /n.hom/

A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B13, A21/B21 (*hoh* in all instances except A5, B5, and B13)

OB: *sum*

OM: *pi*

Gloss: three

Blagden: three

Shafer: three

Than Tun: three

Tha Myat: သုံး 'three'

Katō: 三 'three'

Krech: three

pa /pa(C)/

A23/B24

OB: *phlac·ciy'·teh*.

OM: °*or·dap*.

Pali: *hotu*

Gloss: irrealis copula: may ... be!

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: cause (?)

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: polite marker ဝါ

Katō: no gloss

Krech: emphatic

paṁh /päh/

A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B12, A12/B13, A13/B13, A23/B24, A26/B28

OB: *piy*·

OM: *kil*·

Gloss: to give

Blagden: to give; perhaps also in A23, A26, though there the meaning is not so certain.

Shafer: to give, permit

Than Tun: to give

Tha Myat: ပံ့သည့် 'to help', ပေးသည့် 'to give'

Katō: ပံ့ပေး 'to give'

Krech: to give

Jenny: A26/B28: lit. 'to give', postverbal permissive causative

pau /po/

A4/B4, A5/B5, A7/B7, A8/B8, A8/B9, A9/B10, A10/B11, A13/B13, A14/B14, A17/B17, A18/B18, A20/B20

OB: *thiv*·

OM: *goh* *gohh*·

Gloss: that

Blagden: that, the

Shafer: that (?), the (?), then (?)

Than Tun: that

Tha Myat: ထို 'that'

Katō: ထို 'that'

Notes: I reject Blagden's comparisons with OB *thuiv*· and *thiv*· and modern Burmese *thui* 'that' since I read this word with *p* and not *dh* as he did.

pḍamḥ /p.ḍä(C)h/

A23/B24

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: basis

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: attainment (?), piercing (?)

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: ကူညီ 'to help'

Katō: no gloss

Krech: may

pḍi

See *pli*.

pḍum.sgum.damḥ.ba /p.ḍu(C) s.gu(C) da(C)h ba(C)/

A1/B1

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: no equivalent

Gloss: a phrase containing a verb taking 'nirvāṇa' as an object followed by some sort of time expression like 'since'

Blagden: possibly 'to achieve' or 'to enter' (*parinirvāṇa*), or 'to be established' (of the Buddhist religion) + the meaning is undetermined but will depend on that of *pḍum* + no gloss

Shafer: to go + rest (n.)?, religion (?) + perfect (adj.)?

Than Tun: *pdum̐ sgu dam̐h* 'to enter (parinirvāṇa)'

Tha Myat: ပြုသည် 'to do' + *sgu dam̐h* သုဂတ " < Pali *sugata* = ဘုရား ကောင်းစွာကြွသွားတတ်ခြင်း
'the Buddha having gone well' + first syllable of *ba tva* ရောက်၍ 'after reaching'

Katō: *pdum̐ sgu* ပုံပုံပုံပုံ 'to enter nirvana' + (ပုံပုံ restrictive) + ပုံပုံပုံပုံ 'to profess faith'

Krech: Buddhist teachings + Buddhist church + first and second syllables of '1628'

pra /p.rat/

A14/B14 (×2), A23/B23

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: to do

Blagden: to do, done, deed (?)

Shafer: good

Than Tun: A14: done; A23: to do

Tha Myat: ပြု 'to do'

Katō: A14: ပုံပုံပုံပုံပုံ 'splendid', A23: ပုံပုံ 'to make'

Krech: good

priñ·h /p.rin̐/

A2 (*priñ*)/B2

OB: *praññ*·

OM: *ḍuñ*·

Gloss: city

Blagden: city

Shafer: city

Than Tun: city

Tha Myat: ပြည် 'city', မြို့တော် 'royal city'

Katō: ပုံ 'town'

Krech: country

pli /p.ḍi/

A24/B25 (*pḍi*)

OB: *mliy*·

OM: *cov*·

Gloss: grandchild

Blagden: grandchild

Shafer: grandson

Than Tun: child, grandson (IT)

Tha Myat: မြေး 'grandchild'

Katō: ပုံ 'grandchild'

Krech: grandchild

bam̐h

See *bam̐h*.

biñh

See *biñh*.

budha /bu(C) da/

A10/B10, A10/B11 (*budha*), A11/B12, A19 ([*b*]*udha*)/B19, A22/B22, A-/B26, A26/B28 (in all instances spelled *h* except B11 and A19)

OB: *purhā*

OM: *kyek*· 'sacred thing'

Gloss: Buddha

bradima /p.ra ti ma/

A10/B10

OB: °*achari*·

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: image

Notes: Cf. *chah.bo*.

breña /p.re ja/

A23/B24

OB: *prajñā*

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *ñāṇa*-

Gloss: wisdom

Notes:

bro.pdam /p.ro(C) p.da(C)/

A25/B27

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *upadduvaṃ* (*sic*) for *upaddavaṃ*

Gloss: oppression?

Blagden: meaning undetermined, but possibly the phrase which it begins contains the idea of 'violence', 'harm' + no gloss

Shafer: mind (?) + unbelieving (?), believing (?)

Than Tun: harm (?) + no gloss

Tha Myat: ဖြို 'to destroy' + ပြု 'to do' = *bro pdam* ဖြိုဖျက်အနက် 'to destroy'

Katō: ချိတ်ချိတ် 'to smash to pieces' + မြေ 'level (adj.)'

Krech: to make + Buddhist teachings

Notes:

ba /ba/

A1/B1

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *nib*-

Gloss: bound (and unstressed?) negative marker

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: first syllable of *ba tva* ရောက်၍ 'after reaching'

Katō: ခရီး 'to profess faith'

Krech: first syllable of *ba dom* 'Buddhist teachings'; second syllable of '1628'

Notes: no gloss

bah /bah/

A26/B28

OB: negative prefix °*a*-

OM: prohibitive marker *lah*

Gloss: free negative marker

Blagden: possibly an optative negative 'may not'

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: may not

Tha Myat: second syllable of *damṃṃ ḥaḥ* ၵဝ်း 'beside'

Katō: (၇၇) obligative)

Krech: second syllable of *damṃṃ ḥaḥ* 'deva'

Jenny: second syllable of *damṃṃ ḥaḥ* 'excellent (?)'

Notes:

ḥamḥ /ḥāj/

A1/B1, A3/B3, A5/B5, A6/B6, -/B6, A7/B7 (erroneously spelled *ḥimḥ*), A8/B8, A9/B10, A10/B11, A11/B12, A11/B-, A11/B12, A12/B12, A13 (*bamḥ*)/B13 (×2), A14/B15, A15/B15 (×2), A16/B16 (×3), A16/B17, A17/B17 (*bamḥ*), A18/B18, A21/B22, A-/B22, A26 (*bamḥ*)/B27 (*bamḥ*)

OB: A3/B3, A5/B5, -/B6, A6/B6: *pāy*·; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: honorific marker; lord

Blagden: honorific particle or title

Shafer: honorific

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: မြတ်သော 'noble', မြတ်နိုးဖွယ် 'for the purpose of cherishing', ကြည်ညိုဖွယ် 'for the purpose of respect', ဗယ် 'dear'?, အဗယ် 'dear'

Katō: (၇၇၇) 'eminent person'

Krech:

Notes: cognate to OB *pāy*·?

ḥimḥ /ḥiṃ/

A1/B1, A2/B2, A2/B2, A3/B3, A4/B4, A4/B4 (*ḥimḥ*), A5/B5, A5/B5 (*ḥimḥ*), A6/B6, A-/B7 (error for textitbamḥ), A7 (*ḥimḥ*)/B7, A7/B8 (×2), A8/B9, A9/B9, A9/B10, A10/B10, A10/B11, A11/B11, A11 (*ḥimḥ*)/B12 (*ḥimḥ*), A12/B13, A13/B14, A14/B14 (×2), A18/B18 (×2), A19/B19 (×3), A19/B20, A20/B20, A21/B21, A22/B23 (×2)

OB: A3/B3, A4/B4, A5/B5 (first), A6/B6, A11/B11, A18/B18 (first), A19/B19 (first and third), A22/B23 (second): °*e*°*a*·; no equivalent elsewhere, A9/B10, A13/A14: *rakā*; A7/B7, A10/B10, A14/B14 (×2), A21/B21, A22/B23: *ruy*· °*e*°*a*·; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: realis marker (suggested by Julian K. Wheatley; p.c.)

Blagden: particle preceding verbs

Shafer: did

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: ဖြိုး(သည့်) ”, ဖြိုးဖြိုး

Katō: (၇၇) honorific)

Krech: affirmative

Notes:

ḥimḥ.ḥimḥ /ḥi ḥi/

A23/B24

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: myself

Blagden: perhaps meaning 'for myself'

Shafer: no gloss + did

Than Tun: myself

Tha Myat: ။။ 'oneself'

Katō: (။။ ။။) reduplicated honorific)

Krech:

Notes:

budha

See *budha*.

buh /bu(C)h/

A12/B12, A13/B13, A23/B23, A25/B27

OB: A23/B23: /textit°amho°a· 'deed'; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: A23/B23: *sinrañ·* 'deed'; A25/B27 *pa* 'to do'; no equivalent elsewhere

Gloss: to do

Blagden: to do (?)

Shafer: A12, A13: lord; A23, A25: (optative) may

Than Tun: A12, A13: second syllable of *ma buh* 'my lord'; A23, A25: to do

Tha Myat: ။ "

Katō: ။။။ 'offering'

Krech: goal marker

Notes: *pra buh*, lit. 'do do', cannot be a noun 'deed' since it is preceded by a subject *ganih* 'I' rather than a possessor *gi* 'my'.

***ma*¹** /ma(C)/

A9/B9, A23/B23

OB: A9/B9: *so*; A23/B23: no equivalent

OM: A9/B9: *ma*; A23/B23: no equivalent

Gloss: relative marker

Blagden: apparently a particle

Shafer: relative pronoun

Than Tun: A9, A23: no gloss

Tha Myat: negative marker ။(ပဋိသေစကား) (prohibitive word)

Katō: A9: copula; A23: ။။ 'to perform'

Krech: A9: relative marker; A23: first syllable of *ma ganih* 'deed'

Notes: Loan from OM?

***ma*²** /ma(C)/

A12/B12, A13/B13, A19/B19, A-/B20, A25/B27

OB: A12/B12: *su.teh·*; A13/B13: no equivalent; A19/B19, A-/B20, A25/B27: *su*

OM: A19/B19, A25/B27: *ma*; no equivalent elsewhere

Gloss: nominalizer

Blagden: apparently a particle

Shafer: relative pronoun

Than Tun: A9, A19, A25: no gloss, A12, A13: first syllable of *ma buh* 'my lord'

Tha Myat: negative marker ။(ပဋိသေစကား) (prohibitive word)

Katō: A9, A19, A25: copula; A12, A13: ။။ 'to perform'

Krech: A9, A12, A13, A19, A25: relative marker

Notes: Related to *ma*¹?

ma³ /ma(C)/

A26/B28

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: a verb?

Blagden: apparently a particle

Shafer: not

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: negative marker မ(ပဋိဝေဒစကား) (prohibitive word)

Katō: (𑀧𑀺𑀓𑀸) prohibitive)

Krech: negative marker

Jenny: negative marker

Notes: Context rules out *ma*³ being relativizer *ma*¹ or nominalizer *ma*².

*ma*³ may be a verb forming a compound with *pañh* 'to give': 'to permit'?

Although it is tempting to interpret *ma*³ as a negative marker like Written Burmese *ma*, it seems that initial **m* became *h* before vowels in Pyu, and the retention of initial *m* in this word but not in other Pyu negatives (*ha* and *ha*) would need to be explained.

mayah /ma jah/

A3/B3, A5/B5, A6/B6, A8/B8, A18/B18, A21/B22

OB: *mayah* 'queen'

OM: *gna.kyek* 'queen'

Gloss: wife

Blagden: wife, consort

Shafer: queen

Than Tun: wife

Tha Myat: မယား 'wife'

Krech: wife

Katō: 𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀸 'wife'

Notes: If *rvañ-ñh mayah* is a compound 'ruler-wife', its abbreviation Pyu *mayah* 'wife' may have been borrowed into OB as 'queen'.

On the other hand, if initial **m* became *h* before vowels in Pyu, and the initial *m* of this word would need to be explained. Perhaps this word is a borrowing from OB postdating the shift of **m* to *h*.

mahaṭhe /ma ha t^he(C)/

A15/B15 *mhaṭhe*

OB: *mahāther*·

OM: *mhā[the]r*·

Pali: *mahāthero*

Gloss: Mahāthera

Notes:

miñ·

See *rmiñ*·.

mugaṃḍubudadiṣaṭhe /mu ga ḍu pu ta ti sa t^he(C)/

A15/B15 (*mugaṃtubudimṣaṭhe*)

OB: *muggaliputtatissatther*·

OM: *muggaliputtatissatther*·

Pali: *muggaliputtako*

Gloss: Muggaliputtatissatthera

Notes:

mugaṃḍubudadisatthe

See *mugaṃḍubudadisatthe*.

mtu /m.tu/

A7/B8, A24/B-

OB: A7/B8: *rhov*· 'time'; A24/B-: no equivalent

OM: A7/B8: [*kā*]l· 'time'; A24/B-: no equivalent

Gloss: vicinity

Blagden: part of °*o mtu dūṃ* 'nigh unto' and *tiṃ mtu* 'as for'

Shafer: death (?)

Than Tun: A7: nigh; A24: second syllable of *tiṃ mtu* 'as for'

Tha Myat: မတော့ ”

Katō: A7: 𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺 'to be destroyed'; A24: 𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺 'to be destroyed'

Krech: A7: durative-live, A24: three

Notes: Does Krech's gloss imply that *mtu* is an inflected form?

mtau /m.to/

A9/B9

OB: *muy*· 'to raise (a child)'

OM: °*iññim*· 'to feed'

Gloss: to raise (a child)

Blagden: perhaps 'to nourish', 'to foster'

Shafer: to nourish

Than Tun: to nourish

Tha Myat: no gloss

Katō: 𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺 'to remember'

Krech: durative-support

Notes: Does Krech's gloss imply that *mtu* is an inflected form?

mdaṃ.haḥ.ḍaḥ /m.do(C) ha(C)h ḍa(C)h/

A9/B10

OB: °*ok-mi*

OM: *mirnas*·

Gloss: to remember

Blagden: to remember or perhaps 'to nourish', 'to foster' + no gloss + no gloss

Shafer: to remember, recall + no gloss + no gloss

Than Tun: to remember + no gloss + no gloss

Tha Myat: *mdaṃ haḥ* အောက်မေ့သည် 'to remember', သတိရသည် 'to remember' + first syllable of *ḍaḥ dāṃ* ထိုအခါ၌ 'at that time', ရှက်: 'because'

Katō: 𑀢𑀺 'to nourish' + 𑀢𑀺 'him' + (𑀢𑀺? emphatic?)

Krech: DUR-think.of + grammatical morpheme + grammatical morpheme

Notes: Tha Myat regards *ḍaḥ dāṃ* as a loan from Pali *dadā* or *dadaṃ*. But those are feminine and neuter nominative singular forms of an adjective 'giving, to be given', not an adverb 'at that time'. The etymology is also improbable on phonetic grounds: Pali *d* would not be borrowed as *ḍ*, and the Pyu front vowel *aṃ* /ä/ is absent from Indic loans.

mra.ja.na /m.ra(C) ja(C) ŋa(C)/

A24/B26

OB: *sū tac-thū*

OM: *ññah c'en*

Gloss: other person

Blagden: the phrase *mra ja hna* must mean 'any other person' or 'a stranger', or the like

Shafer: *mra* other (?) + *ja* any (?) + *hna* 'person'

Than Tun: any other person

Tha Myat: မြလူ 'stranger', သူစိမ်း 'unfamiliar person', သူတစ်ထူး 'another person'

Katō: *mra* ၇ 'person' + *ja hna* ၇ 'other'

Krech: *mra ja* 'other' + *hna* 'person'

Notes: /m.ra(C)/ may end in a final stop that prevents the lenition of /j/ to y-m [j].

If /m.ra(C) ends in a sonorant, the *j* spelling may be etymological: cf. the spelling of /j/ as *j* in *rajaguma* /rajakuma(C)/.

Tha Myat reads *ja hna* as *ja hna* which he regards as a loan from Indic *jana*-. Tha Myat does not specify whether *jana*- is Sanskrit or Pali; it could be either. This derivation is not possible because Indic *n* would not be borrowed as *hn*.

mhaṭhe

See *mahaṭhe*.

yaṃ /jä/

A2/B2, A11/B11 (×2), A12/B12, A13/B13, A21/B21, A21/B22, A22/B22, A22/B23, A-/B23, A24/B25, A24/B26, A26/B27

OB: °iy· °īy·

OM: vo°a·

Gloss: this

Blagden: this, that (1911), the (1919)

Shafer: this

Than Tun: A2: this; A4: no gloss; အကြင် 'that', ဤ 'this', ယင်း 'that'

Tha Myat: အကြင် 'that', ဤ 'this', ယင်း 'this, that'

Krech: this

Katō: A2: ၇၇ 'here', ၇၇ 'this'

rah.sah /ra(C)h sa(C)h/

A11/B12

OB: °aphei°a· 'for'

OM: *rampo*· 'portion'

Gloss: on behalf of

Blagden: on behalf of

Shafer: thy (?) + on behalf of (?)

Than Tun: on behalf of

Tha Myat: ရစား '?', အဖို့ 'for the sake of', အစား 'instead of', ကိုယ်စား 'on behalf of', အတွက် 'for the sake of', အကျိုးငှာ 'for the benefit of'

Krech: no gloss + *sah* son

Katō: ၇ 'king' + ၇၇ 'son'

Notes: Krech *sa* son

rajaguma /ra ja ku ma(C)/

A4/B4, A6/B7, A8/B9, A18/B19, A22/B22

OB: *rājakumār*·

OM: *rājakumār*·

Pali: *rājakumāra*-

Gloss: Rājakumāra

Notes: The *j* spelling may be etymological. The expected spelling of an intervocalic /j/ is †*y-m*. The word almost certainly ends in /r/ like its OB and OM equivalents.

rabai /rapaj/

A20/B21

OB: *ra pāy*·

OM: *rapāy*· (*rahay*· in A may be a sequence of *pa* plus a short *ā* resembling *ha*.)

Pali: absent

Gloss: Rapāy

rimadham·narbu /ri ma dam na r.pu/

A2 *rimadhanarbu*/B2

OB: °*arimaddanapur*·

OM: °*arimaddanapur*·

Pali: °*arimaddana-nāmasmi pure* 'in the city named Arimaddana'

Gloss: Arimaddanapura

Notes: 'Enemy-crushing-city', the Pali name for Pagan.

roh /ro(C)h/

A8/B8, A20/B20

OB: *rhov*· 'time'

OM: [*kā*]l· 'time'

Gloss: realis copula

Blagden: apparently a particle, perhaps meaning 'when'

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: when

Tha Myat: အချိန်ကာလ 'time'

Katō: (𑀕𑀲𑀭𑀸 predication)

Krech: time

Notes: Cf. OB *rhov*· 'time', WB vivid narrative marker *ro*

rpu /r.pu/

A7/B7

OB: *nhac*· *chāy*·

OM: *ḥār cvas*·

Gloss: twenty

Blagden: twenty

Shafer: twenty

Than Tun: twenty

Tha Myat: ၂၀ 'twenty'

Katō: 𑀕𑀲𑀭𑀸 'twenty'

Krech: twenty

Notes: Katō: *nāsu*, Krech: *tsav*

rmi

See *rmiñ*·.

rmiñ· /r.miṇ/

A2/B2 (*min*·), A3/B3, A4/B4, A5/B5, A8/89, A19/B19 (*rmi* in all instances except B2 and B3)

OB: *maññ*· 'to be named'

OM: °*imo*°*a*· 'name; to be named'

Gloss: to be named

Blagden: second syllable of °*o rmin*· 'name, called, named'

Shafer: name

Than Tun: second syllable of °*o rmin*· 'called'

Tha Myat: အမည် ဟု ခေါ်သည် 'to be named'

Katō: 𑄢𑄢𑄢 'name'

Krech: name

Notes:

rvañ·mḥ /r.baṅ/

A3 (*rvamḥ*)/B3

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: ruler?

Blagden: °*o rvamḥ* 'queen'; possibly two words °*o* and *rvamḥ*

Shafer: clever

Than Tun: queen

Tha Myat: မိဖုရား 'queen'

Katō: 𑄢𑄢𑄢𑄢 'beloved'

Krech: °*o rvamḥ* 'king'

Notes: *rvañ·mḥ mayah* may be a compound 'ruler-wife' that is elsewhere abbreviated as *mayah* 'wife'.

la /ḍa/

A3/B3, A24/B25 (×2), A24/B26 (×2) (*ḍa* in all instances except for the second instance in A24)

OB: *laññ·gon*·

OM: *lah*

Gloss: or

Blagden: A3: apparently means 'was'; A24: 'be it' or 'either ... or'; cf. Early Burmese *laññ*·?

Shafer: A3: and (?); A24: either ... or ...

Than Tun: A3: was; A24: be it

Tha Myat: A3/B3: second syllable of *don·mḥ ḍaZ ḥamḥ* မှတ်သောမင်းကြီး 'great noble king'; elsewhere: လည်း "

Katō: A3: 𑄢𑄢𑄢 'and'; A24: 𑄢𑄢𑄢 'be (imperative)'

Krech: A3: to pass/leave; A24: alternative marker

vamrabadiṃṃ /va ra pa(C) di(C)/

A17 (*vamrabadiṃṃ*

OB: *varapaṇḍit*·

OM: *varapaṇḍit*·

Pali: *varapaṇḍito*

Gloss: Varapaṇḍita

vam /ba/ or /va/

A5/B5, A6/B7, A12/B12, A13/B13, A22/B23, A25/B26

A12/B12 *nada*

OB: °*ā* except in A12/B12 where there is no equivalent

OM: *ku* except in A12/B12 where there is no equivalent

Gloss: locative noun?

Blagden: °*o varṇ* to, to her (A5)

Shafer: dative (of 3d pers. pron.)

Than Tun: A5: °*o varṇ* to her; A6, A22, A25: °*o varṇ* to; A12, A13: °*o varṇ* no gloss

Krech: °*ovam* king

Katō: 𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓 'sake'

vradam̐yoh

See *vrahmadam̐yoh*.

vrahmaba /p.ra ma pa(C)/

A16/B16

OB: *brahmapāl*·

OM: *brahmapāl*·

Gloss: Brahmapāla

vrahmadam̐yoh /p.ra ma da joh/

A16 (*vradam̐yoh*/B16

OB: *brahmadiv*·

OM: *brahmadiv*·

Pali: *brahmadevo*

Gloss: Brahmadeva

sam̐h /sä(C)h/

A20/B20

OB: *lhot*· 'to dedicate'

OM: *busac*· 'to dedicate'

Gloss: to make

Blagden: to pronounce, to declare (?)

Shafer: to pronounce (a dedication)

Than Tun: to pronounce

Tha Myat: (ဝိဘတ်စကား)၊ နိဗ္ဗာန် (၌) ”

Katō: 𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓 'to declare'

Krech: to make

Notes: Cognate to *se*?

sah /sah/

A4/B4, A6/B7, A8/B8, A11/B12, A18/B18, A-/B22, A24/B25

OB: *sah*

OM: *kon*·

Gloss: son

Blagden: child, son

Shafer: son

Than Tun: child

Tha Myat: သား ”

Katō: 𑀓𑀓 'son'

Krech: son

sagam̐sirva /sa ga si r.wa/

A17 (*sagam̐si*/B17

OB: *saṅghasena*

OM: *saṅghasena*

Pali: *saṅghasenavho*

Gloss: Saṅghasena

sagha /sa ga/

A17/B17

OB: *skhañ*· 'lord'

OM: *tirla* 'lord'

Pali: *bhikkhu*- 'monk'

Gloss: saṅgha

samanarḍoṇṇiḥ /sa(C) ma na r.ḍo(C)h/

A20 ([sa]manarḍo[h]), B20

OB: *sak·munalon*·

OM: *sak·munalor*·, *sak·munalon*·

Pali: absent

Gloss: Sakmunalor

Notes: Luce 1985 I: 39 on "Sak village of Munalon"

saveññudeña /sa we j̥u te j̥a(C)/

A23/B24

OB: *sarvvaññutaññāṇ*·

OM: *sarvvaññutaññāṇ*·

Pali: *sabbaññutā* *sabbaññūtā*

Gloss: omniscience

Notes: Sanskrit: *sarvajñātā*

si /si(C)/

A2/B2, A3/B3, A4/B4, A5/B5, A8/B9, A14/B14, A19/B19

OB: A3/B3: *phlac*·; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: A3/B3: *das*·; no equivalent elsewhere

Gloss: to be

Blagden: the root meaning is apparently 'to be', though in A14 it is difficult to see how that meaning can be appropriate

Shafer: to speak, to say, to call (by name)

Than Tun: to be

Tha Myat: realis verb suffix သည်

Katō: 呼ぶ 'to call'

Krech: to exist

Notes: Contra Tha Myat, unlikely to be equivalent of the Burmese realis verb suffix သည် since it is of much lower frequency than that ubiquitous marker. If Pyu does have an equivalent of သည်, it is more likely to be *ḥimḥ*.

siri /si ri/

A1/B1

OB: *śrī*

OM: *śrī*

Pali: *śrī*

Gloss: opening phrase 'glory!'

Notes: Only the Pyu text contains Pali *siri*; all others including the Pali contain Sanskrit *śrī*. *siri* is not a Pyu localization of Sanskrit *śrī* since Pyu permits the consonant sequence *sr*. The Pyu version of Sanskrit *śrī* is *sri* as in A3/B2.

su /su(C)/

A16/B17

OB: *son[.]*

OM: *son·*

Gloss: Sona

sumedhabadiṃṃ /su me da pa(C) tī(C)/

A15, B16 (*saumedhabadiṃṃ*)

OB: *sumedhapaṇḍit·*

OM: *sumedhapaṇḍit·*

Pali: *sumedhatta sumedho ti laddha-nāmo ca paṇḍito* 'a pundit, wise of self and having acquired the name Sumedha'

Gloss: Sumedhapaṇḍita

se /se/

A10/B10, A12/B12, A19/B19

OB: A10/B10: *plu*; A12/B12: *plō°a*; A19/B19: *mū*

OM: A10/B10: *kin[d]aṃ*; A12/B12: *pa*; A19/B19: *kandaṃ*

Gloss: to make

Blagden: to make

Shafer: to make

Than Tun: to make

Tha Myat: causative marker ခေ

Katō: 𑀧𑀺𑀭𑀸 'to make'

Krech: to make

saumedhabadiṃṃ

See *sumedhabadiṃṃ*.

stabana /s.ta pa na/

A19/B19 (*staḥana*)

OB: *thāpanā*

OM: *thāpanā*

Gloss: to enshrine

Blagden: to enshrine, to set up (a sacred image)

Shafer: to enshrine

Than Tun: to enshrine

Tha Myat: 𑀇𑀺𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀺𑀭𑀸 'placement'

Katō: 𑀧𑀺𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀺𑀭𑀸 'to dedicate to something religious'

Krech: to enshrine

Notes: An interesting case of an Indic noun borrowed as a verb.

staḥana

See *stabana*.

stau /s.to(C)/

A19/B20

OB: *°athot·*

OM: *clon·*

Pali: *thūpika-* 'spired'

Gloss: spire

Blagden: spire of a pagoda

Shafer: spire

Than Tun: spire of pagoda

Tha Myat: ဘူပ 'stupa'

Katō: 尖塔 'pointed stupa'

Krech: spire/stupa

Notes: Blagden, Than Tun: < stupa

sni[n̥]·h /s.niŋ/

A2/B2, A7/B7 (*sniḥ* in all instances except for B2)

OB: °*anhac*·

OM: *cnām*·

Pali: *vassānam*

Gloss: year

Blagden: year

Shafer: year

Than Tun: year

Tha Myat: နှစ်ကာလ 'a year's time', နှစ် 'year', ခုနှစ် 'a year'

Katō: 年 'year'

Krech: year

sniḥ

See *sni[n̥]·h*.

sri /s.ri/

A3/B2

OB: *śrī*

OM: *śrī*

Pali: absent

Gloss: glory!

Notes: < Skt *śrī*

sriḥ /s.ri(C)h/

A7/B8

OB: *mū*

OM: *kmin*·

Gloss: to reign

Blagden: to reign (?)

Shafer: to reign (?)

Than Tun: to reign

Tha Myat: Skt *śrī* 'royal prosperity, regal splendor'

Katō: 病 'to be ill'

Krech: ruler

Notes: Krech has a noun preceded by AFF.

sruḥ /s.ru(C)h/

A24/B25

OB: °*achuy*

OM: *kulo*

Gloss: kinsman

Blagden: kinsman, relative

Shafer: kinsman

Than Tun: kinsman

Tha Myat: ဆွေ 'friend', ဆွေမျိုး 'relatives', အဆွေအမျိုး 'close friends and relatives'

Katō: မိမိ 'relatives'

Krech: relative

ha /hak/

A14/B14 (×2)

OB: *kon*.

OM: *thic*.

Gloss: good, well

Blagden: good, well (?)

Shafer: deed (?)

Than Tun: well

Tha Myat: ကောင်း 'well'

Katō: မိမိ 'that'

Krech: grammatical morpheme

hi /hi/

A5/B6, A7/B8

OB: A5/B6: *syī*; A7/B8: *siy*.

OM: A5/B6: *cuti*, A7/B8: *scuti* 'will die'

Gloss: to die

Blagden: to die

Shafer: to die

Than Tun: to die

Tha Myat: သေသည် 'to die'

Katō: မိမိ 'to die'

Krech: to die

hoh

See *nhoh*.

hña.dīm /ŋa(C) dī(C)/

A17/B17

OB: °*amhok* 'presence'

OM: *kinta* 'before'

Pali: *saṃmukhā* 'in front'

Gloss: presence

Blagden: first two syllables of *hña.dīm dūṃ* which appears to mean 'in the presence of'

Shafer: persons

Than Tun: A17: first two syllables of *hña.dīm dūṃ* which appears to mean 'in the presence (of)'

Tha Myat: A17/B17: first syllable of *hña.dīm* အမှောက် 'presence' (?), မျက်မှောက် 'under one's nose (figuratively)'

Katō: *hña* မိမိ 'front' + *dīm* မိမိ 'near'

Krech: *hña* 'presence' + locative *dīm*

Also see *mra.ja.hña*.

hñim.chi /ɲi(C) cʰi(C)/

A25/B27

OB: °*anhip*·°*acaka*

OM: °*upadrov*· 'harm'

Gloss: violence

Blagden: violence (? cf. Early Burmese °*anhip*·?) + violence (?); cf. Early Burmese °*acak*·?

Shafer: heart (?), thought (?) + evil (?)

Than Tun: violence

Tha Myat: ညှဉ်းဆဲး 'to torture, treat badly'

Katō: ဖိနှိပ် 'to oppress' + ခံရ 'to receive damage'

Krech: to oppress + first syllable of *chi ga* 'to be afraid'

***hḍimh*¹** /ṇi(C)h Dī(C)h/

A7/B8

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: nominalizer

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: to destine (?)

Than Tun: second syllable of 'to be sick'

Tha Myat: လှူသည် 'to donate', ပေးသည် 'to give'

Katō: ချစ် 'like'

Krech: grammatical morpheme

***hḍimh*²** /Dī(C)h/

A25/B26

OB: *lhū* 'to offer'

OM: *ku* 'to give'

Gloss: to dedicate

Blagden: to dedicate to, to make a gift to pious uses (cf. Early Burmese *lhū*?)

Shafer: to destine (?), to dedicate (?)

Than Tun: to dedicate to

Tha Myat: လှူသည် 'to donate', ပေးသည် 'to give'

Katō: A7: ချစ် 'like'; A25: second syllable of *gamh hḍimh* ချစ် 'offering'

Krech: A7: grammatical morpheme; A25 : to give/offer to

Notes: Probably cognate to *hḍī*, either 'to dedicate' or 'dedication'.

hḍī /Dī(C)/

A20/B20

OB: *lhot*· 'to dedicate'

OM: *busac*· 'to dedicate'

Gloss: to dedicate or dedication

Blagden: dedication formula (?)

Shafer: dedication formula

Than Tun: dedication

Tha Myat: လွတ် 'to be free from', လှူသည် 'to donate'

Katō: ချစ် 'to joyfully give one's assets to charity'

Krech: donation

Notes: *gom °o hḍī* may either be a noun compound 'cave-pagoda dedication' with *°o* nominalizing a verb *hḍī* or a noun + possessed noun sequence 'dedication of the cave-pagoda'. In either case, *hḍī* is probably cognate to *hḍimḥ* 'to dedicate'.

hnimḥ /nĩ(C)h/

A7/B8

OB: *nā*

OM: 'jeý·

Gloss: to be sick

Blagden: to be sick (cf. Early Burmese *nā*?) + ?

Shafer: to be sick (?)

Than Tun: first syllable of *hnimḥ hḍimḥ* 'to be sick'

Tha Myat: နာမကျန်: 'to be sick and not healthy', နာဖျား: 'to be sick with fever'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'to wither'

Krech: to be near

hra /ra(C)/

A13/B13

OB: *pur[h]ā* 'Buddha'

OM: *kyek*· 'sacred thing'

Gloss: sacred image

Blagden: sacred image (?)

Shafer: Buddha (? cf. Old Burmese *puhrā*)

Than Tun: sacred image

Tha Myat: ဘုရား: 'Buddha'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'Buddha'

Krech: no gloss

Notes: Tha Myat regards this word as a loan of a Sanskrit *hri* 'Buddha', but there is no such word.

hra[t]·m̐ /rät/

A2/B2, A7/B7 (*hram̐* in all instances except B2)

OB: *het*·

OM: *diññcām*·

Pali: *°aṭṭha-*

Gloss: eight

Blagden: eight

Shafer: eight

Than Tun: eight

Tha Myat: ၵံ 'eight'

Katō: 𑜀𑜢𑜤𑜰𑜫 'eight'

Krech: seventh syllable of '1628'

hram̐

See *hra[t]·m̐*.

°arimedeyam̐ /°a ri me de ja/

A26/B28

OB: *°arimittiryā*

OM: *trey· metteý*·, lit. 'sacred being Metteyya'

Pali: *metteyya-dīpadindassa* 'Metteyya, lord of bipeds'

Gloss: Āriyametteyya

°o /°o/

A2/B2 (×2), A3/B3 (×3), A4/B4 (×2), A5/B5 (×2), A6/B6, A6/B7 (×2), A7/B8, A8/B8, A8/B9 (×2), A9/B9, A10/B10, A12/B12, A13/B13, A14/B14, A17/B17, A18/B18, A19/B19, A19/B20, A20/B20, A-/B22, A22/B23, A25/B26

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: no equivalent

Gloss: marker of possessed nouns; nominalizer; third person pronoun before accusative marker *dimn*

Blagden: a particle used (1) to connect numerals with a noun, A2; (2) after words in the genitive relation, A4, A6-A10, A18-A21; (3) in certain other combinations not falling clearly under these heads, A3, A14, A17; (4) first syllable of °o *rmiñ*· 'name, called, named'

Shafer: third person pronoun

Than Tun: first syllable of °o *rmiñ*· 'called'; otherwise no gloss

Tha Myat: ၏န့်များကို နှာမိန့်စကားဆက် 'connects numbers to nouns and words'; A4, A6-A10, A18-A21 သာမိကာရက - ပိုင်ဆိုင်သောပစ္စည်း စကားအဖြစ် 'the possessive case - being a word of things that are possessed'; A3, A14, A17: genitive marker ၏

Katō: [?] 'his', [?] 'her', [?] 'of that', [?] 'their', ([?]) nominalizer, ([?]) adverbializer

Krech: A2: plural; A2-A6, A8-A10, A14, A17-A21: third person pronoun; A7: negative; A5, A6, A12, A13, A22, A25: first syllable of °o *vam*

7 Conclusion

The Kubyaukgyi inscription is only the beginning of my studies of Late Pyu. I also plan to examine the other two Late Pyu inscriptions which are also multilingual: the Sino-Pyu bilingual Tharaba Gate inscription (PYU 11) and the quadrilingual Myittha inscription in Mon, Pali, Pyu, and Sanskrit (PYU 39). Sein Win's (2016) reading of PYU 11 has unusual characteristics and needs careful reexamination, and both it and PYU 39 need to be studied from a grammatical perspective.

8 Apparatus

There is no agreement on how to represent Pyu in Roman letters. To facilitate comparisons, all readings have been converted as much as possible into the Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions system (hereafter, 'the Corpus system') used in this study.

Different romanization systems often make readings look more divergent than they actually are. Differences are of two types: systematic and nonsystematic.

I list all nontrivial systematic correspondences between transliteration systems at the top of each language section. Trivial correspondences such as *w* for the *v* of the Corpus system are not noted. The anusvāra that some scholars write as *ṃ* is consistently represented as *m̐* following the Corpus system to avoid confusion with the Corpus system letter *m̐* which represents a subscript dot.

Some systems use symbols which are typographically difficult to reproduce: e.g., Blagden [1919b]'s three vertically stacked circles for *m̐h̐* after *i*. I always convert such symbols into their Corpus system equivalents.

I ignore differences in hyphenation, spacing, and the use of brackets and parentheses around otherwise identical text.

I also ignore different ways of handling an identically read akṣara broken across two lines: e.g., Duroiselle [1919a] sometimes writes the entire akṣara on the first line (e.g., *si°a·* in OB A17-A18) but sometimes splits it across lines (e.g., *kyon·* in OB A19-A20).

If a reading matches the Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions reading (hereafter, 'the Corpus reading') after correspondence rules are applied, it is treated as identical to the Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions reading, and only a romanization in the Corpus system is given. For instance, Krech [2012]'s ' before vowels corresponds to *m̃* after vowels in the Corpus system. Hence Krech [2012]'s *d'oh* in Pyu A3 is equivalent to the Corpus reading *domh̃*, and both are combined in a single listing for *domh̃*.

If two or more non-Corpus readings match each other after correspondence rules are applied, they are combined in a single listing with their shared reading converted into the Corpus system: e.g., Shafer [1943]'s *plā·* and Krech [2012] read *plamh̃* in OM A23. Both readings are equivalent to *plamh̃* in the Corpus system, and are written as *plamh̃* here despite their different forms in the original publications. The Corpus system regularization *plamh̃* contrasts with the Corpus reading *pḍamh̃*.

If a reading does not match any other reading even after correspondence rules are applied, that reading may contain elements absent from the Corpus system. Often parts of these sui generis readings cannot be converted into the Corpus system: e.g., Krech [2012]'s Pyu *av* has no equivalent in the Corpus system which lacks a means to write codas that are not represented by subscript consonants in the Pyu script. Hence Krech's transliteration *av* is left as without a dot to distinguish it from the vowel-subscript consonant sequence *av·*.

All Burmese script transliterations of OB, OM, Pali, and Pyu are converted into the Corpus system. ပ is consistently transliterated as *ñña* regardless of whether it corresponds to a single or a double /p/ in any given word in any given language. $\text{ပ} = \text{ñña}$ is not in any Burmese script transliteration of the Kubyaukgyi inscription.

Conversely, တ is consistently transliterated as *ṭha* regardless of whether it corresponds to a single or a double stop in any given word in any given language. $\text{တ} = \text{ṭha}$ is not in any Burmese script transliteration of the Kubyaukgyi inscription.

The distribution of ပ ပ တ တ in Burmese script transliterations reflects the distribution of their 12th century Mon-Burmese script equivalents in the Kubyaukgyi inscription: ပ တ are present and ပ တ are absent. Consequently the Corpus readings have *ññ ṭh* but not *ñ ṭṭh*. These readings reflect what is on stone and not what was necessarily on people's lips: e.g., Mon *ññah̃* 'person' was phonemically /pah/ with a single /p/ even though it was written with *ññ*.

8.1 Old Burmese

The majority of differences between readings involve the perceived presence or absence of the °asat·.

F: Forchhammer 1892; A1-A29 only in Burmese script; F· : C· ' and C· °a·, F· *e : C· °e°a·, F *dhuiv·* : C *thuiv·*, F *prov·* : C *plo°a·*.

Bl₀₉: Blagden 1909; A only in Burmese script

Bl₁₀: Blagden 1910 lists a few corrections of Bl₀₉ in Burmese script.

D: Duroiselle 1919; D· ' : C· ' and C· °a·, D· e' : C· °e°a·, D· ie : C· ei, D· ñ : C· ññ

N: Nishida 1955; only sporadic notes on B; N ' : C ' and C °a·, N e' : C °e°a·, N â : C o, N ö : ui, N ü : ei, N ñ : C ññ;

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006; Sa N : C ññ, Sa @_tV@' : tui°a·, Sa thVw' : C thuiv·

Y: Yabu 2006; Y ie : C ei; Y distinguishes between ' and °a· in Burmese transliteration but not in Roman transliteration. Y's use of ' and °a· in Burmese transliteration matches C precisely, so I ignore the ambiguous use of ' for both ' and °a· in Roman transliteration.

Y consistently has 𑄢 = ññ in Burmese transliteration and ñ in Roman transliteration corresponding to C ññ.

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (Griffiths, Wheatley, and Miyake's reading; accessed ??? 2018)

A1 FBl₀₉DSaYC *śrī*, N *srī*

A1 FBl₀₉DSaYC *buddhāya*, N *buddhaya*

A1 Bl₀₉DSaYC *skhañ*·, FN *sakhañ*·

A2 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *ryā*, F *rā*

A3 Bl₀₉DNSaYC °īy·, F °iy·

A3 Bl₀₉DNSaYC °arimaddanapur·, F °arimaddhanapura

A4 Bl₀₉DSaYC *nhik*·, FN *nhuik*·

A4 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *dhammarāj*·, F *dhammarāja*

A5 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *phlac*·, F *phrac*·

A5 FDNSaYC *ta*, Bl₀₉ *tha*; Bl₀₉ ∞ *tha* may be a typo for ∞ *ta*.

A7 FBl₀₉DSaYC *mañ*·, N *man*·; N's *n*· may be a typo since *n*· and ñ· look nothing alike, and he read ñ· in the same word elsewhere: e.g., A8.

A7 FBl₀₉DNSaYC *ta mu*; Bl₀₉ speculates the original text (that was the basis of the inscription?) had *tamū*.

A8 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *kumār*·, F *kumāra*

A10 Bl₀₉C *syī*·, FDSaY *sīy*·, N *siy*·; an unusual combination of °asat· atop *sī* atop subscript *y*. Bl₀₉ regards this as an error for *siy*·.

A10 Bl₀₉DNYC *kha*, F *khe*, Sa *kha*·

A10 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *hnañ*'·, F *hnañ*·

A11 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *hnañ*'·, F *hnañ*·

A12 Bl₀₉DNYC *sā* °a· *sā*, F *sā ra so*, Sa *sā*'(·) *sā*

A12 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *rājakumār*·, F *rājakumāra*

A12 FBl₀₉DNSaYC *so*; Bl₀₉ suggests an alternate reading *po* for *so*.

A13 Bl₀₉DNC *bri ru*, F *pri ru*, Sa *bri rū*, Y *brī rū*

A14 Bl₀₉DC *y'a* °e°a· || *siy*·, F *y*· **e*. *siy*·, N *ye*'· *siy*·, Y *y'a* °e°a· *siy*·, Sa *y*'· °e'· || *siy*·; the line begins with an unusual combination of *y* atop subscript °a without an °asat·. There is no space for an °asat· beneath the descender of the °e on the line above. Bl₀₉ thinks *y*'· °e°a· || *siy*· was intended.

A14 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *nā*, F *rā*

A14 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *rhov*·, F *nhoñ*·

A14 Bl₀₉DSaYC *nhik*·, F *nhuik*·, N *nhok*·; N's *o* may be a typo for *ö* which is *ui* in the C transliteration system. There is no *o* in N's transliteration system. N's equivalent of *o* in the C transliteration system is *â*, not *o*.

A14 FBl₀₉DNSaC *rājaku*·, Y *rāj·ku*·

A15 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *-mār*·, F *-māra*

A15 FBl₀₉DNYC *pay*·, Sa *pāy*·

A15 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *mimī*, F *mimi*; Bl₀₉ thinks this may have been *mimi* in the original text.

A15 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *keiv*·, F *ña kiv*·

A16 F has a dash before *grī* presumably indicating lost text.

A16 Bl₀₉C *kla ññjo*, F *kra ñjo*, DSa *kla ñjo*, N *klañ jo*; Y's Burmese transliteration has *kla ññjo*, but his romanized transliteration has *klañjo*.

A16 Bl₀₉DSaYC *skhañ*·, FN *sakhañ*·

A17 Bl₀₉DSaYC *ruy*· °*e*°*a*·, F *ruy*· **e*·, N *ruye*'·

A17 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *nhap*· *liy*· *su rhov*·, F lost

A17 FBl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*·, N °*īy*·

A18 Bl₀₉DNSaYC °*a*· *min*'·, F *v*· *min*·

A18 FBl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*·, N °*īy*·

A18 YC *skhaña*, Bl₀₉DSa *skhañ*·, FN *sakhañ*·; there is no space for an °*asat* beneath the subscript *h* of the line above.

A18 Bl₀₉NSaYC °*aphei*°*a*·, F °*apheiv*·, D °*aphei*'·

A18 Bl₀₉NSaYC °*ati*°*a*·, F °*athiv*·, Bl₁₀ °*abhi*°*a*·, D °*ati*'·

A18 DNSaYC *kyon*·, FBl₀₉ *kyvon*·

A19 DNSaYC *kyon*· *sum rvoh*·, FBl₀₉ *kyvon*· *sum rvoh*·

A19 Bl₀₉NSaYC °*atui*°*a*·, F °*athiv*·, °*atui*'·

A20 Bl₀₉DSaC *skhañ*·, FN *sakhañ*·, Y *skhaña*

A20 Bl₀₉YC *saññ*·, FDNSa *sañ*·

A20 FBl₀₉Bl₁₀DYC °*iya rhuya*, NSa °*iy*· *rhuy*·; Bl₀₉ thinks °*iy*· *rhuy*· was intended. N °*iy*· is curious, as his OB vowel list does not include a vowel *ī*. Is N's *i* a typo for *ī*, or was *i* accidentally omitted from his OB vowel list?

A20 Bl₀₉NSaYC °*atui*°*a*·, F °*atuiv*·, D °*atui*'·

A21 Bl₀₉NSaYC *ye*°*a*·, F *yev*·, D *ye*'·

A21 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *thiv*·, F *dhiv*·

A21 NSaYC *klui*°*a*·, F *kriv*·, Bl₀₉ *phlui*°*a*·, D *klui*'·

A22 Bl₀₉SaYC *ruy*'· °*e*°*a*·, F *ruy*· **e*·, D *ruy*'· °*e*'·, N *ruye*'·

A23 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *mahāther*·, F *mahādhēr*·

A23 FBl₀₉DSaYC *grī*, N *gri*

A23 Bl₀₉DSaYC *muggaliputtatissatther*·, F *muggaliputtatissathther*·, N *muggaliputtatissātther*·

A25 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *son*·, F *serā*

A26 FBl₀₉DSaYC *t*·, N *ta*

A26 Bl₀₉DSaYC *skhañ*·, FN *sakhañ*·

A26 Bl₀₉NSaYC *tui*°*a*·, F *thuiv*·, D *tui*'·

A27 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *thiv*·, F *dhiv*·

A27 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *brī*, F *bri*

A27 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *thuiv*·, F *dhuiv*·

A27 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *rājakumār*·, F *rājakumāra*

A27 FBl₀₉DNSaYC *ma yā* °*a*, Sa *ma yā*°*a*·; Bl₀₉ suggests an alternate reading *ma yā*°*a*·. N's text of A has a correction *mayā*'· on the basis of B, as explained in endnote 84.

A28 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *thiv*·, F *dhiv*·

A28 Bl₀₉DSaYC *thāpanā*, F *dhāpanā*, N *thāpaṭhnā*

A28 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *ruy*'·, F *ruy*·

A28 FBl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*·, N °*īy*·

A28 Bl₀₉DNSaYC °*athot*·, F °*adhok*·

A29 FBl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*·, N °*īy*·

A29 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *brī*, F *prī*

A30 Bl₀₉DSaYC *nhik*·, N *nhuik*·

A31 Bl₀₉DSaYC *hen*· *buiv*·, N *hen*· *bov*·; Bl₀₉ cites an unpublished reading *mon*· *dhuiv*· by Taw Sein Ko. N's *o* may be a typo for *ö*. See note on A14 N *nhok*·.

A31 DSaYC *rvoh*· || °*iy*·, Bl₀₉ *rvobh*· || °*iy*·, N *rvoh*· || °*iy*·; Bl₀₉ ၁၂ *bh*· may be a typo for ၁၂ *h*·.

A32 Bl₁₀DSaYC *yo*, Bl₀₉N *yā*

A33 YC °*iya kū*, Bl₀₉DSa °*iy*· *kū*, N °*īy*· *kū*; there is no space for an °*asat* beneath the *ru* of the line above.

A33 Bl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*· *sei*°*a*·, N °*īy*· *sei*'·

A34 Bl₀₉DSaYC *min*'·, N *min*·

A34 Bl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*·, N °*īy*·

A34 Bl₁₀DSaYC *ñā*, Bl₀₉N *rā*

A34 YC *sarvvaññutañā*·, D *sarvvañññutañā*·, N *sarvvaññutañā*·, Sa *sarbbaññutañā*·; Bl₀₉ writes the word in Burmese as သ္ရဝ္ဗာဏ္ဏုတဏ္ဍ, noting that he intends သ္ရဝ္ဗ to form a single akṣara with a superscript *r* and without an °*asat*·. It is not clear whether he would transliterate ဏ္ဍ in intervocalic position as *ñ* or as *ññ*, so I do not know if he intended *sarvvaññutañā*· or *sarvvañññutañā*·. Bl₁₀ does not comment on this word.

A35 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀SaYC *prajññā*, DN *prajñā*

A35 Bl₁₀DSaYC *sū*, Bl₀₉ *narū*, N *narā*

A35 DSaYC *ciy*'·, Bl₀₉N *ciy*·

A35 Bl₀₉DSaYC *ña*, N omit

A36 DSaYC °*achuy*·, Bl₀₉ °*achvay*·, Bl₁₀ °*achay*·; Bl₀₉ suggests a second possible reading °*achviy*·. N finds this word difficult to read and supplies °*achuy*· from B32.

A37 Bl₀₉DSaYC *thū*, N *tū*

A37 Bl₀₉DSaYC °*iy*·, N °*īy*·

A38 N has °*ā* at the end of this line instead of at the start of A39.

A38 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀DNYC °*acaka*, Sa °*acak*·; Bl₀₉ thinks °*acak*· was intended.

A39 SaYC °*arimittirya*, Bl₀₉DN °*arimittiyā*; C reads a stroke above *y* as superscript *r*. This stroke is connected to the subscript *y* of the line above.

A39 Bl₀₉DSaYC *skhañ*·, N *sakhañ*·

A39 C °*aphu*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀DNSaY °*aphū*; Bl₀₉ suggests an alternate reading °*achu*·.

A39 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *ciy*·, Sa *siy*·; did Sa accidentally transliterate ၁ as *s* with the modern Burmese pronunciation of ၁ in mind?

B1 DSaYC || *śra* || *namo*; N cannot make out this part of the text and guesses that *śrī* might have been there.

B1 SaC *buddhā*, D *buddhāya*; D sees the first stroke of *ya*. Y has *buddhā* in Burmese transliteration but *buddhāa* in Roman transliteration.

B1 Bl₁₀ speculates that there was a second *śrī* || after *buddhāya* ||. It is not clear whether Bl₁₀ is citing *buddhāya* || from A or, like D, is seeing a *ya* || that SaYC do not see.

B1 C *skhañā*, DSaY *skhañ*·

B2 SaC *n(h)ac*·, D omit, Y (*nhac*·)

B2 DYC *brī*, Sa *prī*

B2 SaDC *ma*; Y has *ma* in Burmese transliteration but *m* in Roman transliteration.

B7 D sees || amidst the damage on the left.

B8 C (°*a*), DSaY omit

B9 DYC omit, Sa *piy*'·

B9 DSaC *mañ*·; Y has *mañ*· in Burmese transliteration but *man*· in Roman transliteration.

B10 DSaC *sīy*·; Y has *sīy*· in Burmese transliteration but *sīv*· in Roman transliteration.

B10 DSaC *mū*, Y has *mū* in Burmese transliteration but *mu* in Roman transliteration.

B10 YC *Ce*, DSa *e*; only the dependent vowel symbol *e* is visible at the right edge of the line. The consonant symbol that it is attached to is on the lost left side of B11. DS may have intended *e* to be the dependent vowel symbol, but they also use *e* to transliterate $\epsilon = C^{\circ}e$.

B11 DNYC *pay*·, Sa *pāy*·

B12 C *kla ññjo*; Y has *kla ññjo* in Burmese transliteration but *klañio* in Roman transliteration.

B12 YC *r[h](u)[y]·[◦]a*, DSa *rhuy*·

B13 C *[ñ](·) [p]lu ru*, DSaY omit

B14 YC *ya /// na* $\diamond [^{\circ}e^{\circ}a]$, DS omit

B14 DYC *ll*, Sa omit

B15 DC *°atei°a(·)*, Sa *°ati°a*·, Y *°atei*

B15 C *y*, D *yā*, SaY omit

B15 C *l*, DY *ll*, Sa omit

B16 DSaYC *ña*, Bl₁₀ illegible

B16 Bl₁₀ sees a mark of unknown function beneath *piy*·.

B17 DSaYC *thiv*·, Bl₁₀N *thuiv*·

B17 C *rhov*·, DSaY *rvov*·

B18 YC *klui°a*·, D *klui'*·, Sa *klV°a*·

B18 DSaC *lh(e)ñ'*·, Y *lh ñ'*·

B18 DYC *e*, Sa omit

B19 DSaC *°e°a*·; Y includes this in his Burmese transliteration but omits it from his Roman transliteration.

B20 DSaC *brahma*, Y *prahma*

B22 SaC *°am(ho)*, D *°am*, Y *°ame*; only the *e*-shaped left side of *o* is visible.

B22 C *ha*, DSaY *h*

B23 DSaC *rājak*, Y *rājaku*

B24 C *hu*, DSaY omit

B24 DSaYC *s[o]*; although Y has *(e) sā* in Roman transliteration, his Burmese transliteration (၆၀)∞ makes it clear that *(e) sā* represents a *so* with a supplied first half of *o* rather than *(°e) sā* = (၆) ∞.

B25 DSaC *ra (k) /// (°i)y*·, Y *ra (kaa i)y*·

B25 C *lho(t·)*, DSaY *lho*

B25 C */// · ///*, DYSa *///*

B26 DSaYC *rvoh*·, Bl₁₀N *rvo*

B26 DSaC *(t)*, Y omit

B26 DYC *hen·buiv*·, Sa *hen·bVv*·

B27 C *[p/s]lī*, DSaY *(sum)*; D sees *[p/s]lī* but expects *sum* on the basis of A.

B28 C *rājaku(mā)[r]· (maññ)*·, DSa *rājakumā*, Y *rājakumār*·

B29 SaC *seī°a*·, D *sīe'*·, Y *sīe°a*·

B30 C *sarvvaññutaññāñ*·, D *sarwwaññutaññāñ*·, Sa *sarbbaññutaññāñ*·; Y has *sarvvarññuta ññāñ*· in Burmese transliteration but *sarvvarññuta ññāñ*· in Roman transliteration.

B30 SaC *praññjā*, DNSa *prañjā*; Y has *praññjā* in Burmese transliteration but *prañja* in Roman transliteration.

B30 DC *ap'*·, SaY *am'*·; D regards *ap'*· as an error for *am'*·.

B31 DYC *noñ·*, Sa *ña noñ·*; Sa has read the left half of *o* twice, first as *ña*, and then as the left half of *o*.

B31 C *laññ· goña*, DSaY *lañgoñ·*

B31 DYC *ciy·*, Sa *siy·*; Sa seems to have transliterated *o* according to its modern Burmese pronunciation *s*.

8.2 Old Mon

Bl₀₉: Blagden 1909; A only; Bl₀₉ *a-ut* : C *°a°ut·*, Bl₀₉ *ñ* : C *ññ*, Bl₀₉ *te°a·* : C *vo°a·*, Bl₀₉ *titar·* : C *ticār·*; Bl₀₉ proposes *ticār·* and *tivār·* as alternate readings. Bl₀₉ does not contrast this word in A18 with the similar words in A19-A21, so presumably his remarks about the instance in A18 also apply to all further instances. Bl₀₉ does not distinguish between independent vowel symbols and combinations of C *°a* with dependent vowel symbols: e.g., it is unclear whether Bl₀₉ *-u* is equivalent to C *°u* (= *ṁ*) or C *°u* (= *ṁ*) in a subscript position. I retain Bl₀₉'s vocalic notation and list all cases of ambiguity other than *a-ut*.

Bl₁₀: Blagden 1910; corrections to Bl₀₉ and first reading of B; Bl₁₀ *ñ* : C *ññ*; Bl₀₉ *titar·* : C *ticār·*; Bl₁₀ is "still in doubt" about *titar·* but considers *ticār·* to be more probable than *tivār·*. Bl₁₀ regards the word read by C as C *vo°a·* as ambiguous between *te°a·* and *vo°a·* in both versions of the Mon text of the Kubyaukgyi, but consistently reads *vo°a·* on the basis of the Shwezigon inscription.

Bl₁₂: Blagden 1912; further corrections to Bl₀₉; Bl₁₂ *ñ* : C *ññ*

Bl₁₉: Blagden 1919; A with notes on differences between A and B; Bl₀₉ *a-ut* : C *°a°ut·*, Bl₁₉ *ñ* : C *ññ*; Bl₁₉ reads *ticār·* like C but also proposes *titar·* as a less probable reading and *tivār·* as the least probable reading. Bl₁₉ does not distinguish between independent vowel symbols and combinations of C *°a* with dependent vowel symbols: e.g., it is unclear whether Bl₁₉ *-u* is equivalent to C *°u* (= *ṁ*) or C *°u* (= *ṁ*) in a subscript position. I retain Bl₁₉'s vocalic notation and list all cases of ambiguity other than *a-ut*.

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006; A only; Sa *N* : C *ññ*; Question marks reproduced verbatim.

J: Jenny and McCormick 2014; A1 to the middle of A27 only; J *°ut* : C *°a°ut·*; J *ñ* : C *ññ*

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (Arlo Griffiths' reading; accessed ??? 2018)

A1 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *tirley·*, Bl₀₉ *tīley·*

A2 Bl₁₂Bl₁₉SaJC *dīññcām·*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀ *dijhām·*

A4 C *e*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ omit; this *e* is repeated at the start of the next line as the left side of *o*.

A8 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaC *°a°ut·*, J *°ut*

A8 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *kīryā·*, Bl₀₉ *kīyā*

A8 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *ḍik·*, Bl₀₉ *ḍika*; the text of Bl₀₉ states there is no virāma in *ḍika*, though the transcript in Bl₀₉ has *ḍik·* with a virāma.

A10 Bl₁₂Bl₁₉SaJC *dīññcām·*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀ *dijhām·*

A11 SaJC *°jey·*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉ *°ajey·*; Bl₀₉Bl₁₀ state that *j* is subscript but transliterate as *°ajey·* rather than as *°jey·*.

A11 C *kaun·*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ *kon·*

A12 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *mīr·nas·*, Bl₀₉ *mibas·*; Bl₀₉ provides less likely readings *mivas·*, *mibas·ṁ*, *mivas·ṁ*.

A12 Bl₁₂Bl₁₉SaJC *°iññcim·*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀ *°ijhim·*

A13 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *jīrku·*, Bl₀₉ *jīku*

A13 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *kindam·*, Bl₀₉ *kinnam*; Bl₀₉ also provides a less probable reading *kinnum*.

A14 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaC *°ey· ḍik· pa*, J *°ey· pa*

A14 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *pa ram-*, Bl₀₉ *par*.

A15 Bl₁₀SaJC *po°a*·, Bl₀₉Bl₁₉ *pā°a*·; Bl₁₀ sees a space where the *ā*-shaped right half of *o* should be and thinks that half was either worn away or accidentally omitted. Bl₁₉ thinks *po°a*· in B may have been what was intended for A as well.

A15 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *tirla dik*·, Bl₀₉ *tīla dik*·

A15 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *tirla kil*·, Bl₀₉ *tīla kil*·

A16 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *tirla*, Bl₀₉ *tīla*



A16 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaC *da°a*·, J *da*

A17 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *gappumas*·, Bl₀₉ *garāe ma°a*·; Bl₀₉ *rōe* is a transliteration influenced by /ri:/, the modern Khmer pronunciation of *r̥*. Bl₀₉ cites "friends" who read the first two akṣaras as *gapyu*. Bl₀₉ acknowledges the possibility that the third akṣara is *mas*·.

A17 Bl₀₉Bl₁₉SaC *thic*· *°ā thic*· *°ā*, J *thic*· *°ār*· *thic*· *°ār*·

A17 C *p*·, Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ *pa*, Bl₀₉ *saṃ*

A18 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *tirla*, Bl₀₉ *tīla*

A19 Bl₁₉CSa *muggaliputtatissatther*·, Bl₀₉ *muggaliputtatissa t-her*·, J *muggaliputtatissather*·; Bl₀₉ *t-h* is a  *t* with a subscript *h*, not  *th*.


A21 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *tirla*, Bl₀₉ *tīla*

A24 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *kandam*, Bl₀₉ *kannam*



A24 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJC *busac*·, Bl₀₉ *būsac*·

A25 C *e*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ omit; this *e* is repeated at the start of the next line as the left side of *o*.

A26 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaC *lor*·, J *lon*·

A26 C *rahay*·, Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ *rapāy*·; Bl₀₉ sees *rahay*· but reads *rapāy*· on the basis of OB. Compare with *rapāy*· in B34 which has a tall *ā*: i.e., .

A26 C omit, Bl₀₉ *gin*· *up*·, Bl₁₀ *gir-uy*· or *gin-uy*·, Bl₁₉ *gir-uy*·, Sa ????·, J *gir?uy*·; Bl₀₉ acknowledges *gir*· as a possible reading. Bl₁₀ acknowledges *gin*· as a possible reading.

A27 C *p*· *l*, Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ *y*·, Bl₀₉ *p*·; a stroke connecting the *p*· and *l*-like parts of *y*· is missing. Bl₀₉ regards the *l*-like stroke as the beginning of an  *m* accidentally written before the left half  of *o*. He does not regard the stroke as a single *daṇḍa* since a double *daṇḍa* is consistently used as the sole punctuation mark in this text. Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaJ ignore this stroke.

A27 SaC *°a'ut*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₉ *°a-ut*, J *°ut*

A27 Bl₀₉Bl₁₉C *cut*· *dek*· *ku*, Sa *cut*· *ḍe?? ??*; J reading ends right before this phrase.

A28 SaC *māpanā*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ *thāpanā*; Bl₀₉ acknowledges that the first consonant looks like *mā* but believes it is still distinct from *m* and is an incomplete *th*. Bl₁₉ also regards that consonant as an incomplete *th*.

A28 Bl₁₀Bl₁₉C *vo°a*· *rāḍhanā rov*· *vo°a*·, Bl₀₉ *te°a*· *rāḍhanā rov*· *te°a*·, Sa *vo°a*· *rāḍhanā rov*· ????·

A29 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉SaC *sinraṇ*·; Bl₀₉ regards *pinraṇ*· as a possible reading.

A29 C *dap*·, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀Bl₁₉Sa *das*·

A29 Bl₀₉Bl₁₉C *sarvvaññutaññāṇ*·, Sa *sarvvaññ???ññāṇ*·

A30 Bl₀₉Bl₁₉C *kulo*, Sa *kul*?

A31 SaC *c°eṇ*·, Bl₀₉Bl₁₉ *c-eṇ*·

A31 Bl₁₉SaC *pa*, Bl₀₉ *par*·; after this akṣara there is a vertical stroke with a curve on the bottom matching the curve of the following *°u*; perhaps the scribe thought of the *pa* and then the *°u* of the following word *°upadrov*· before starting over and writing *°u* properly.

A31 Bl₀₉Bl₁₉C *ḍi*, Sa ??

B1 C *u(d)[dh]*, Bl₁₀ *Bu[d]dh*

B2 C °a /// *moya lñima*, Bl₁₀ *ā[r] moy lñim*·; the virāmas of the last two akṣaras have been lost to damage.

B3 Bl₁₂C *diññcām*·, Bl₁₀ *dijhām*·

B3 C *du*, Bl₁₀ omit

B13 Bl₁₂C *diññcām*·, Bl₁₀ *dijhām*·

B15 C *go* ///, Bl₁₀ *goḥ*; Bl₁₉ speculates that B originally had *goḥh*·.

B16 Bl₁₂C °iññcim·, Bl₁₀ *ijhim*·

B16 C omit, Bl₁₀ *k[i]nda[m]*

B17 C *kyak*·, Bl₁₀ *kyek*·; the *e* of *kyek*· is presumably at the end of the previous line but is not visible in the RTI. Hence *kyek*· looks like *kyak*·. The *e* may still have been visible in Bl₁₀'s time.

B24 C *mhāthe* ///l, Bl₁₀ *mhāther*· (ll)

B26 C *brah* /// *pāl*·, Bl₁₀ *brahmapāl*·

B27 C /// [va ll *tī*cār(·), Bl₁₀ *d[i]v· ll titar*·; the left and top of B27 seems to have been considerably damaged since Bl₁₀'s time.

B30 Bl₁₉ speculates that B originally had *goḥh*·.

B35 C *tvāññāḥh· gir°uy*·, Bl₁₀Bl₁₉ *tvāññ· hegir-uy*·

B36 C °ut·, Bl₁₀Bl₁₉ *ut*

B42 C *c°en*·, Bl₁₀ *c-en*·

8.3 Pali

F: Forchhammer 1892; A1-31 only in Burmese script

Ts: Taw Sein Ko's transcript as printed in Blagden 1909; only A6-A8 in part on p. 1050, A15-16 in part on p. 1033; A19-21 in part on p. 1038, A30-A40 on p. 1022

Bd: Mrs. Bode's corrections and emendations for Ts as printed in Blagden 1911; with the exception of one emendation, it is not clear if she is providing readings or emendations, so I provide all other forms that she supplied whenever they differ from C.

D: Duroiselle 1919; periods indicating lost text reproduced as is

Tm: Tha Myat 1958a; in Burmese script

L: Luce 1980; B33-B43 only

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006; A only

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (Arlo Griffiths' reading; accessed ??? 2018)

A1 DSaC *yaṃ*, F *ti*

A2 C °*anādikaṃ*, FDSa °*anārikaṃ*

A3 FC °*aṭhavī-*, DSa °*aṭṭhavī-*

A4 C *cāpare*, F *sāsane*, DSa *vā pare*

A5 DSaC *mahabbalo*, F *mahapbalo*

A7 TsDSaC *tilokavaṭaṃsikā*, F *tilokavaṭasikā*, Bd *tilokāvataṃsikā*

A11 DSaC *tassā*, F *tassa*

A12 FC *bhuññjituṃ*, DSa *bhuññjituṃ*

A14 FC °*aṭhavīsati*, DSa °*aṭṭhavīsati*

A15 FTsDSaC *māranantikarogassa*, Bd *māraṇantikarogassa*

A16 DSaC *narādhipe*, FTs *narādhīpe*

A16 DSaC *mahantaṃ*, F *mahanta*

A17 FC *saññcayaṃ*, DSa *sañcayaṃ*

A18 FSaC *sumānaso*, D *sumānaso* ||; D's metrically arranged edition has a || absent from his other edition.

A20 DSaC °*akāsim*, FTs °*akāsi*

A20 TsDSaC *vo*, F *te*

A20 FDSaC *varam*, Ts *varam*

A23 FC ññ *cā*, TsDSaC ñ *cā*

A24 FC *tuṭṭhahattho*, TsDSaC *tuṭṭhahattho*

A25 TsDSaC || *dayāparo*, F | °*aparāparo*

A26 TsDSaC *paṇḍito* ||, F *paṇḍito*

A29 FTsDSaC *sakkhin*, Bd *sakkhim*

A31 C *paṭiṭhāpiya kāresi*, BdDSa *paṭiṭhāpiya kāresi*, F *pati*, Ts *patitthāpiya kāresi*

A32 TsDSaC *paṭimāya*, Bd *paṭimāya*

A32 TsDSaC *nibbinno bhavaśaṅkate*, Bd *nibbiṇṇo bhavaśaṅkhate*

A33 BdDSaC *karontena*, Ts *karentena*

A34 C *sabbaññutaññānapativedhāya*, Ts *sabbaññutaññānam pativedhāya*, DSa *sabbaññutaññānapativedhāya*

A35 DSaC *yattakā*, Ts *yatthakā*

A36 TsDSaC *paṭimāya*, Bd *paṭimāya*

A38 DSaC °*assaddha*, Ts °*asaddha*

A39 TsDSaC *upadduvarṇ*, Bd *upaddavarṇ*

A40 DSaC *metteyyadipadindassa*, Ts *metteyyadipadinnassa*, Bd *metteyyadīpadinnassa*

A40 DSaC *nāthigacchatū*, Ts *nādhigacchatū*

B2 C *suṇ*, D *suṇā*

B3 C °*aṭṭhavīsā* ◇ *dhike*, D °*aṭṭhavīsā* ◇ *dhike*

B4 C *cāpare*, D *vā pare*

B7 C (*t*) /// *sā*, D /// *sā*

B10 C *pasanno*, D *pasano*

B10 C *savvadā*, D *sabbadā*

B10 C [*dā*] *saparibhogena*, D ..*saparibhogena*

B11 C *ga(t)āya*, D *ga?āya*

B12 C °*aṭṭhavīsati*, D °*aṭṭhavīsati*

B13 C (*k*) *arogassa*, D ..*rogassa*

B14 C (*ma*) *hantaṃ*, D ..*hantaṃ*

B20 C *taññ*, D *tañ*

B22 C *tu* ◇ *ṭhahattho*, D *tuṭṭhahattho*

B22 C *pa*, D *ma*

B23 C *hero*, D *thero*

B27 C (*ja*) *laṃ*, D ..*laṃ*

B28 C *tat(o)*, D *tate*; despite differences in transliteration; both C and D see the same thing: the left side of *o* resembling *e* and a damaged right side.

B29 C *subhaṃ*, D ..*ubha*

B29 C *i*, D omit

B29 C (*kāresi gu*), D omit

B30 C [*ha*] (*ka*) /// [*vā na*], D omit

B33 DC *puññaṃ*, L *puṇaṃ*

B33 DC *samācitaṃ*, L *sasācitaṃ*

B33 C *sabbaññutaññāṇaṃ*, D *sabbaññutaññāṇaṃ*, L *sabbaññutaññāṇaṃ*

B34 LC *pahivedhāya*, D *pativedhāya*

B37 DC °*añño*, L °*añño*

B37 C *ññātaṃ*, DL *ññātaṃ*

B38 LC [*pā*]*pasaṅkappa*, D . . *pasaṅkappa*

B39 C *yyapadduvaṃ*, D *textityyupadduvaṃ*, L *yyapadduvaṃ*

B39 DC *narādhamo*, L *narādhamo* or *nanādhamo*

B39 LC *mittiyyadi*, D *mittiyadi* d

MYSTERY LINES TO BE SUPPLIED???:

B40 C , D omit

B41 C , D omit

B42 C , D omit

8.4 Pyu

All readings of Pyu generally ignore Z except for the Pyu script versions of Tt and Sw, Sf's commentary, and the transliterations of Kr and C. Only instances where Tt and Sw lack a Z present in C are noted.

Bl₀₉: Blagden 1909; only two readings of Pyu words that differ from those of Bl₁₁

Bl₁₁: Blagden 1911; A with notes on B; Bl₁₁ °*u* : C °*o*, Bl₁₁ *ū* : C *u* (but the reverse is not always true, as some C *u* correspond to Bl₁₁ *u*), Bl₁₁ °*o* 'village' : C *kra*, Bl₁₁ *ḍhau* : C *pau*, Bl₁₁ *būḥ* : C *ḥuḥ*, Bl₁₁ *mī* : C *rmi*

Bl₁₉: Blagden 1919; A with notes on B; same equivalences as Bl₁₁ except B *mi* : C *rmi* . The *ra*-like *daṇḍa* | is not distinguished from the simple vertical line *daṇḍa* /; both are transliterated as | : C /.

Sf: Shafer 1943; A with notes on B; same equivalences as Bl₁₁; Sf *l* represents a phoneme /l/ rather than an Indic character *textit{l}*. Sf believes the Pyu used a non-*l* character (Bl₁₁ and Bl₁₉'s *ḷ*) to write an /l/-like phoneme. Z is absent from transliteration but present in the commentary unless noted.

Tt: Than Tun 1958; A only; same equivalences as Bl₁₉, except that *ḥ* is *b* and 'village' is *ro*. Although Tt distinguishes between *b* and *ḥ* in the Pyu script, Tt's Burmese and Roman transliteration systems have no *ḥ*.

Tm: Tha Myat 1958a; same equivalences as Tt, except Tt *ḍho* : C *pau* and Tm *ḷe* : C *ḍa* (but not in B3).

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006, A only; same equivalences as Bl₁₁ except Sa *mi* : C *rmi* and Sa *rh* : C *hr*. Question marks reproduced verbatim.

Ka: Katō 2005; A only in phonemic notation without punctuation; Ka ~ : C *m̃* (only exceptions in which Ka ? : C *m̃* or Ka ʔ : C *m̃* are noted), Ka ʔa : C °*o*, Ka ʔo 'village' : C *kra*, Ka ʔf : C *g-m̃*, Ka *tāḍa* : C *tdamḥ*, Ka *d'* : C *d-m̃*, Ka *daʔ* : C *damḥ*, Ka *du* : C *pau*, Ka *ḥ* : C *ḥ*, Ka *buda* : C *ḥudha*, *māya* : C *mayah*, Ka *mi* : C *rmi*, Ka ʔy : C *y-m̃*, Ka *yā* : C *yam*, Ka *rajagama* : C *rajaguma*, Ka ʔw : C *v-m̃*

Kr: Krech 2012; A with notes on B; Kr ' : C -*m̃*, Kr *m̃* : C *m̃*, ʔa : C °*o*, Bl₁₁ *ḍhau* : C *pau*, Ka *ḥav dha* : C *ḥudha*, Ka *ḥavḥ* : C *ḥuḥ*, Ka *mi* : C *rmi*

Sw: Sein Win 2016; B only as an eyecopy and in Burmese transliteration; Sw °*u* : C °*o*, Sw *kra* : C *ro*, Sw *ññ* : C *ñ*, Sw *b* : C *ḥ*, Sw *būḥ* : C *ḥuḥ*, Sw *būḍha* : C *ḥudha*, Sw *rmi* : C *mi*; Sw *ḷe* : C *ḍa* (but not in B3); Z is absent from transliteration but present in the eyecopy unless noted.

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (accessed ??? 2018)

A1 KrC *I*, Bl₁₉Sa //, Bl₁₁SfKa omit, TtTm /

A1 Bl₁₁C || *siri* ||, Bl₁₉TtTmSa // *siri* //, SfKa *siri*, Kr *rara siri rara*; Ka does not include punctuation in his phonemic rendering of A, but it is clear that unlike Kr, he does not regard the *daṇḍas* as *akṣaras*.

A1 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaC *pdu*, Tm *plū*, Ka *pādum*, Kr *pdavm*

A1 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmC *sgu*, SaKr *sgum*, Ka *sāgə*

A1 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *tva*, Kr *tav*

A1 Bl₁₉SfSaC *1000*, Bl₁₁ *cū*, Tt *thū*, Tm ?, Ka ?, Kr *thav*; Tm reproduces the Pyu sign as is in his Burmese transliteration.

A1 Bl₁₉SfSaC *600*, Bl₁₁ *jha*, Tt *trurā*, Tm ?, Ka ?, Kr *sāv*; Tm reproduces the Pyu sign as is in his Burmese transliteration.

A2 Bl₁₉SfSaC *20*, Bl₁₁ °e, Tt *nsū*, Tm ?, Ka ?, Kr *tha*; Tm reproduces the Pyu sign as is in his Burmese transliteration.

A2 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *hram*, Ka *hra?*

A2 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *sniḥ*, Ka *sāniḥ*

A2 Bl₁₁SfTtTmKrC *tvamḥ*, Bl₁₉Sa *tvamḥ*, Ka *tvamḥ*

A2 Bl₁₁SfTtTmSaKrC *tha damḥ*, Ka *tha dam?*; Bl₁₉ has *tha da* in the transcription of the text but *tha dam* in his glossary where it is equated with *ta damḥ* (sic).

A2 C *rimadhanarbu*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *rimadhanabū*, Ka *rimadhanabu*, Kr *rimadhana Rbav*

A3 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmC *tribhuvaṇnadimṇṭya*, Sa *tribhuvanadimṇṭya*, Ka *tribḥ-vaṇnadimṇṭya*, Kr *tribhuvaṇnadimṇṭya*; the function of the hyphen in Ka is unknown.

A3 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *dhamaraja*, Ka *damaraja*

A3 Bl₁₉SfSaKaKrC *domḥ*, Tt *dom*; Tm has *domḥ* in the transcription of the text but *dom* in the glossary.

A3 C *ḍaZ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Sa *ḍa*, SfKa *la*, Tt *ḷa*, Tm *da*, Kr *laZ*; Bl₁₉ proposes *ḷa* as an alternative reading.

A3 C *rvamḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmSa *vomḥ*, Tt *voḥ*, Ka *vemḥ*, Kr *vamḥ*; Bl₁₉ is uncertain about the vowel.

A4 C *tridogavaṇḍasaga*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSa *trilogavaṇḍasaga*, SfKaKr *trilogavaṇḍasaga*

A4 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmKaKrC *demviṇ*, Sa *demvi*; Tt has *demviṇ* in Burmese transliteration and *deviṇ* in romanization; his Pyu eye-copy has subscript dots under each *akṣara*.

A5 C *nhoh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKr *hoh*

A5 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmSaKrC *ta damḥ*, Tt *taṃ damḥ*, Ka *ta dam?*; Bl₁₉ has *ta damḥ* in the transcription of the text but *ta dam* in the glossary.

A6 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *mayah* °o, Kr (*ḥamḥ mayah*) ?a; Kr sees a blur on A and supplies two words on the basis of B6.

A6 TmKrC *dra*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKa *tra*

A6 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaC *tḥaḥ*, Tm *tūḥ*, Ka *tāḥaḥ*, Kr *tvav*

A7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *sniḥ*, Ka *sāniḥ*

A7 C *rpu*, Bl₁₁ *ṣū* or *dū*, Bl₁₉SfSa *tpū* or *npū*, TtTm *nsū*, Ka *nāsu*, Kr *tsav*

A7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *hram*, Ka *hra?*

A7 C *bimḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSaKaKr *ḥimḥ*; TmTt have *ḥimḥ* in their Pyu eye-copies but *bimḥ* in transliteration.

A7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC //, Kr //○ //; K's phonemic transcription excludes punctuation.

A7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmKaKrC *ḥimḥ hniḥ*, Tt *ḥimḥ hniḥ*, Sa *ḥiḥ hniḥ*

A7 C *hđimh*, Bl₁₁TtTm *hlimh*, SfKaKr *hlimh*, Sa *hlih*; Bl₁₉ has *hlih* in the transcription of the text but *hlimh* in the glossary.

A7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *mtu*, Ka *mātu*

A7 KaC *dum*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSa *dūm*, TtTm *lūm*, Kr *davm*; Tt has *lū* in romanization but *lūm* in Burmese transliteration; his Pyu eye-copy has a subscript dot.

A9 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKrC *mtau*, Tm *mtō*, Ka *mātu*

A9 Bl₁₁SfKaC *to*, Bl₁₉TtTmSa *tom*, Kr *tho*; Bl₁₁ thinks what appears to be *tom* has an accidental subscript mark.

A9 C *kdeh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Sa *loh*, Sf *loh*, TtTm *kleh*, KaKr *kleh*

A9 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSaKaKrC *troh*, TtTm *jroh*

A9 Bl₁₁SfTtKrC *mdaum*, Bl₁₉Sa *mdau*, Tm *mdo*, Ka *mādum*

A9 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSaC *dah*, SfKa *lah*, Kr *dah*; Bl₁₉ proposes alternate readings *lah* and *leh*.

A9 Bl₁₁SfTtTmKrC *dam̃m*; Sa *da??*, Ka *dam?*; Bl₁₉ has *da* in the transcription of the text but *dam̃m* in the glossary.

A10 C *tlu*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *tū*, Ka *tu*, Kr *tav*; Bl₁₁ proposes an alternate reading *tkha*.

A10 TmC *bimh tuh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSa *ḃimh tuh*, Ka *ḃimh t̃ah*, Kr *bimh bhuḥ*; Tt has *ḃimh* in his Pyu eye-copy, though the Burmese and Roman transliterations have *bimh*.

A11 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC *thmuḥ*, Ka *thāmuh*, Kr *thmavḥ*

A11 C *doh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtSa *loh*, SfKaKr *loh*, Tm *lo*

A11 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *tdimh*, Ka *tādīmḥ*

A11 TtTmC *rah sah bimh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSaKa *rah sah ḃimh*, Kr *rah sa ḃimh*

A12 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmKaKrC *ḃarimh*, Sa *ḃarimh?*

A12 C *ce*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmKaKrSa *che*

A13 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *yam̃ ḃarimh*, Kr *yam̃ bam̃h*

A13 C *doh ḃarimh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSa *loh ḃarimh*, SfKa *loh ḃarimh*, Kr *loh bam̃h*

A13 C *kim*, Bl₁₁ *riḥ*, Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *rim*, Ka *kviṃ*, Kr *k[r]im* or *kviṃ*; Bl₁₉ sees *riḥ* as a possibility but favors *rim* on the basis of B14.

A14 C *pha*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKa *pa*; Kr *ḍha*; Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ see *pha* but read *pa* after B14.

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKaKrC *dam̃m*, Tm *ḍam̃m*

A14 KaC *na*, Bl₁₁SfTtTmSaKr *nu*; Bl₁₉ has *nu* in the transcription of the text but *niu* in the glossary.

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC *ha pra choḥ ha pra choḥ*, Ka *h̃a pra choḥ h̃a pra choḥ*, Kr *ha pra cho ha pra cho*

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *choḥ ḃimh*; Bl₁₁ sees *chom̃h ḃimh* but reads *choḥ ḃimh* after B14. Bl₁₉ sees *chom̃h* as a possibility for the first akṣara.

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKaKrC *dom̃h*, Tm *lom̃h*

A15 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *mahaṭhe*, Ka *mahaṭhe*; Ka may be seeing retroflex *ṭh* but is phonemically interpreting it as dental /th/.

A15 C *mugaṃḍubudadisaṭhe*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSa *mūgaṃḷubūdadaṣaṭhe*, Sf *mūgaṃḷubūdadaṣaṭhe*, Ka *mugaṃḷəḃudadisaṭhe*, Kr *mav gaṃ (tu ḃav) da diṃ sa ṭhe* with (tu ḃav) supplied on the basis of B.

A15 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC *sumedhabadiṃm̃*, Ka *sumedabadiṃ?*, Kr *sav me dha ba diṃm̃*; both Tm and C acknowledge *su* was inserted.

A15 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *vrahmaba*, Ka *vārahmaba*

A16 C *vradam̃yoḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *vradem̃yoḥ*, Ka *vārahmadem̃yoḥ*, Kr *vra (dai) yoḥ*; Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ have doubts about *e*.

A16 KaC *su*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *sū*, Kr *sav*

A17 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *sagaṃsi*, Bl₀₉ *sagasi*; given that Bl₀₉ omitted the visarga in his transliteration of *hivūḥ* (A20) believing it to be a tonal mark, the absence of an anusvāra in *sagasi* may mean that Bl₀₉ did not see an anusvāra or that he did see it but ignored it as a tonal mark.

A17 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *vaṃrabadīṃṃ*, Ka *vaṃrabadīṃ?*

A17 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *sagha*, Kr *saṃ gha*

A17 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *tvo*, Kr *tov*

A17 KaC *hña*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKrC *hñu*, Tm *h?*; Tm writes the Pyu subscript character beneath a Burmese *h*.

A17 KaC *dum*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *dūṃ*, Kr *davṃ*

A18 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *tu*, Ka *tu?*

A18 C *tdum*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *tdūṃ*, Ka *tādum*, Kr *tdavṃ*

A18 Bl₁₁SfTtTmKaKrC *ta damṃ*, Sa *ta dam?*; Bl₁₉ has *tada* in the transcription of the text but *tadamṃ* in the glossary.

A19 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmSaKaKrC *ma*, Tt omit

A19 Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC ||; Bl₁₁Kr see a blur

A19 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *stabana*, Ka *sātabana*

A19 C [*b*]udha, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtSa *gūdha*, Sf *būdha*, Tm (*bu*)dha, Ka *ḥuda*, Kr *bhav dha*

A19 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKrC *stau*, Tm *sto*, Ka *sātu*

A19 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSaC *tha ḥi(ṃḥ)*, SfKa *tha ḥiṃḥ*, Kr *tha ḥi*; Tt has *ḥi* in the Pyu script but has *ḥi* in his Burmese or Roman transliterations. Sf and Ka have supplied the anusvāra and visarga from B20 without comment.

A20 C *hḍī*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtSa *hlau*, SfKr *hlau*, Tm *hlo*, Ka *hlu*

A20 TmKrC *roh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKa *toḥ*; Bl₁₉ proposes *roh* as an alternate reading supported by B20.

A20 C *samanardoh*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ *samanaḷōṃ*, TtTmKr *samanaḷōṃ*, SfKa *samanaloh*, Sa *samanaḷo°om*; Bl₁₉ acknowledges the superscript hook that C reads as *r* but regards it as casting doubt on the vowel of the final akṣara. The macron in Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ seems to symbolize that hook rather than vowel length.

A20 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtKrC *rabai*, Tm *rab?*, Sa *raba°i*, Ka *rabay*; Tm writes the Pyu vowel character atop a Burmese *b*. K's phonemic transcription is probably equivalent to the transliteration *rabai* rather than *rabay*.

A20 KaC *jīṃvuḥ*, Bl₀₉ *hivūḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSa *jīṃvūḥ*, Bl₀₉ *hīṃvūḥ*; Bl₀₉ does not include the visarga in his transliteration but states that although it is present in the word, he has omitted it because he believes it to be a tonal mark; Kr regards this word as damaged and supplies the reading *jīṃvavḥ* from B21.

A21 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TmSaKrC (°o saḥ), SfTtKa °o *saḥ*; SfTtKa have supplied these words from B22 without comment.

A22 C *tdum*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *tdūṃ*, Ka *tādum*, Kr *tdavṃ*

A22 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKrC *chai*, Tm *ch?*, Ka *chay*; Tm writes the Pyu vowel character atop a Burmese *ch*. K's phonemic transcription is probably equivalent to the transliteration *chai* rather than *chay*.

A22 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *choḥ*; Kr sees a blur.

A22 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SaKrC (// yaṃ), SfTt // *yaṃ*, Tm (yaṃ), Ka *yaṃ*; SfTtKa have supplied *yaṃ* from B23 without comment. Sf places this word at the start of A23. K's phonemic transcription excludes punctuation.

A23 C *saveñudeña*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKa *saveñodeñe*, Kr *sa ve ño de ña*; Tt has *savehodeñe* in romanization, but this is probably a typo for *saveñodeñe* which is in Burmese transliteration.

A23 KrC *breña*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKa *breñe*

A23 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *nah*; Bl₁₉ sees *nuh* as a possibility.

A23 C *pḍamḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSa *ḥamḥ*, SfKr *ḥamḥ*, Ka *pāḥamḥ*; Tt has *pṭamḥ* in romanization, but this is probably a typo for *ḥamḥ* which is in Burmese transliteration.

A23 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉KrC *paZ*, SfTtTmSaKa *pa*; Bl₁₁ observes Z and considers the possibility of reading it and *pa* together as an akṣara *pi* or *pau*. Bl₁₉ also observes Z and thinks it casts doubt on the vowel of *pa*.

A24 C *tra*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKr *trah*; there is a blank space after *tra* roughly corresponding to where a visarga could have been.

A24 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *mtu*, Ka *mātu*?

A24 C *knamḥ*, Bl₁₁ *kumḥ*, Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *kumḥ*, Ka *kamḥ*, Kr *(kra)mḥ*; this is the only instance of a double anusvāra in Bl₁₁. Bl₁₁ also sees *kumḥ* with a single anusvāra as a possibility.

A24 KaC *dum*, Bl₁₁ *dū*, Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *dūṃ*, Kr *davṃ*; Bl₁₁ also sees *dūṃ* as a possibility.

A24 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SaC *gi saḥ ḍa*, SfKr *gi saḥ la*, Tt *gi saḥ ḷa*, Tm *gi saḥ ḷe*, Ka *gṣ saḥ la*; Bl₁₉ thinks *ḍa* throughout this line could also be read as *ḷa* or *ḷe*. Kr sees a dot to the top right of *la* but doubts it is part of the script, as it is absent from B25.

A24 SfKrC *gi pli la*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Sa *gi pli ḍa*, Tt *gi pli ḷa*, Tm *gi pli ḷe*, Ka *gṣ pāli la*

A24 C *gi sruḥ ḍaZ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Sa *gi sruḥ ḍa*, Sf *gi sruḥ la*, Tt *gi sruḥ ḷaZ*, Tm *gi srūḥ ḷe*, Ka *gṣ sruḥ la*, Kr *gi srūḥ laZ*; Kr sees *gi sruḥ laZ* as a possibility.

A24 KaC *hña*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSa *hñu*, Tm *hna*, Kr *hlu*; Tm transliterates the Pyu subscript character as a character resembling Mon subscript 𑄿 *na* with a hook. My romanization of his transliteration is based on Tm's glossary in which this akṣara is transliterated as *hna*.

A24 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SaC *ḍa yaṃ*, SfKaKr *la yaṃ*, Tt *ḷa yaṃ*, Tm *ḷe yaṃ*

A25 TmC *-dha*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉KrS omit, SfTtKa *ḥudha*

Bl₁₁Bl₁₉S supply *ḥūdha*, Tm supplies *ḥū*, and Kr supplies *ḥav dha* on the basis of B26.

A25 C *ḥdimḥ*, Bl₁₁TtTm *ḥlīmḥ*, SfKaKr *hlīmḥ*, Sa *ḥlīḥ*; Bl₁₉ has *hūih* (sic) in the transcription of the text but *ḥlīmḥ* in the glossary.

A25 Bl₁₉SfTtTmKrC *hñim*, Bl₁₁ *jhīm*, Sa *hñi*, Ka *hñi?*; Bl₁₁ suggests *hñim* as an alternative reading. Bl₁₉ has doubts about his reading.

A25 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKrC *pḍam*, Tm *ḥam*, Ka *pāḍam*

A25 KaC *nuḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *nūḥ*, Kr *javḥ*

A26 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmKaKrC °*arimedeyam*, Sa °*arimedeya*

A26 Bl₁₁SfTtTmKaKrC *ḍamṃ*, Sa *ḍam?*; Bl₁₉ has *ḍam* in the transcription of the text but *ḍamṃ* in the glossary.

A26 C *kḍim*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmKr *ḍim*, Sa *ḍim?*, Ka *kāḍim*; Tt has *ḍimṃ* in Burmese and Roman transliteration but his Pyu eyecopy has no *mṃ*.

A26 C *kchīmḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKr *chīmḥ*, Ka *kāchīḥ*; Tm has *chīmḥ* in the transliteration of the text but the glossary lists *chīmḥ* followed by *kchi* in parentheses.

A26 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKaKrC *tim*; Tm has *tim* in the transliteration of the text but the glossary lists *tim* followed by *ti* in parentheses.

A26 C *tmu*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *tmū*, Ka *tāmu*, Kr *tmav*

A26 C *choḥ //Z*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmSa *choḥ //*, Tt *choḥ Z //*, Ka *choḥ*, Kr *choḥZ //*; Z is located over a blank space in T's eyecopy. Ka does not include punctuation in his phonemic transcription.

B1 SfTmC *dathagaṃḍa*, Sw *dathagada*

B1 C *pdum*, Tm *plūm*, Sw *pa*

B1 KrC *sgum*, Tm *sgu*, Sw *sga*

B1 TmC *damh*, Sw *nah*

B1 C *1000*, TmSw *thū*

B1 C *600*; Tm regards this numeral symbol as equivalent to *trū rā*. Sw regards this numeral symbol as equivalent to *krū rā*.

B2 C *20*, Kr *sāvu*; neither Tm nor Sw transliterate this numeral symbol; they merely reproduce it as is.

B2 C *hra[t]·m*, TmSw *hram*

B2 C *sni[n]·h*, TmSw *sniḥ*

B2 C *tvañ·mñh*, Tm *tvaṃñḥ* Sw *tvamñḥ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B2 C *dañ·mñḥ*, Tm *daṃñḥ*, Sw *dañḥ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B2 C *prīñ·h*, TmSw *priḥ*

B2 C *rimadham·narbu*, SfTmSw *rimadhanabū*

B2 C *miñ·*, TmSw *mi*

B2 C *tribhuvamñadit·mñtya*, Sf *tri?uvamñadimñtya* TmSw *tribhuvamñadimñtya*

B3 C *rmiñ·*, TmSw *mi*

B3 C *doñ·mñh*, TmSw *domḥ*

B3 C *ḍaZ*, Sf *laZ*, TmSw *da*

B3 C *rvañ·mñh*, SfTmSw *voḥ*, Kr *vaṃñḥ*; Sf thinks this looks like *nvamñḥ* or *lvamñḥ* but rejects those readings since *n* and *l* should not be superscripts. C reads that superscript character as *r*.

B3 C *triḍogavadasaga*, Bl₁₁SfTm *triḷogavadasaga*, Bl₁₉ *trilogavadasaga*; Sw *triḷogavadasa*; Sw includes the final akṣara in this word in his eyecopy but does not transliterate it.

B4 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmC *deṃviṃ*, Sw *dempam*

B5 C *nhoḥ*, TmSw *hoḥ*

B6 C *tra*, TmSw *dra*

B6 C *[t]ḥaḥ*, TmSw *tūḥ*

B7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉C *ḥimñḥ*, TmSw *bamñḥ*; Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ regard *ḥimñḥ* as an error for *ḥamñḥ*. It is unclear whether TmSw have silently corrected this error or do not see an *i*.

B7 C *rpu*, TmSw *nsū*

B7 TmC *//0 //*, Sw *// //*

B8 TmC *hniññḥ*, Sw *huiḥ*

B8 C *hḍimñḥ*, TmSw *hḷimñḥ*

B8 C *dum*, Tm *lūm*, Sw *lū*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B8 C *roḥZ*, SfTmSw *roḥ*

B9 TmC *diññḥ*, Sw *diññḥ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B9 C *mtau*, Tm *mtō*, Sw *mthau*

B9 C *tdamñḥ*, TmSw *tdaḥ*

B9 SwC *to*, Tm *tom*

B9 C *kḍeḥ*, Tm *kḷeḥ*, Sw *teḥ*

B9 C *troḥ*, Sw *jroḥ*

B10 TmC *diññḥ*, Sw *diñḥ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B10 C *mdaum*, Tm *mdom*, Sw *pdo*

B10 TmC *chaḥ*, Sw *cha*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B10 C *tlu*, SfTmSw *tū*

B11 C *budha*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmSw *būdha*; Tm and Sw have *ḥ* in their eyecopies but not their transliterations.

B11 C *thmuh*, TmSw *thmūh*

B11 C *ḍoh*, TmSw *ḷoh*

B11 TmC *yañ*, Sw *lañ*

B11 C *nañ*, TmSw *na*

B11 C *toḥZ*, TmSw *toḥ*; Sw has Z in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B12 TmC *ma*, Sw *dha*

B12 C *choḥZ*, TmSw *choḥ*; Sw has Z in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B13 C *k[ra]*, Bl₁₁ omit, TmSw *ro*

B13 C *nhoh*, TmSw *hoh*

B13 C *ḍoh*, TmSw *ḷoh*

B14 C *kiñ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Tm *riñ*, Sw *ri*; Sw has *ñ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B14 C *daññ*, TmSw *ḍaññ*

B14 C *ña*, TmSw *ñu*

B14 TmC *choḥ*, Sw *cho*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B15 C *domḥ*, TmSw *ḷoh*

B15 SfC *mhaṭhe*, Sw *mṭhaṭhe*; Tm has *mnaṭhe* in his reading but *mhaṭhe* in his glossary.

B15 C *mugaṃtubudimṣaṭhe*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TmSw *mūgaṃḷubūdīmṣaṭhe*, Sf *mūgaṃḷubūdīmṣaṭhe*, Kr *mav gaṃ tu ḥav diñ sa ṭhe*

B16 C *saumedhabadiññ*, Tm *somedhabadiññ*, Sw *saumedhabadiññ*

B16 TmC *traḥ*, Sw *tra*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B16 SfTmC *vrahmaba*, Sw *prahmabamḥ*

B16 C *vrahmadamyoḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTm *vrahmademyoḥ*, Kr *vrahmad[ai]yoḥ* Sw *prahmademyomḥ*; Bl₁₁ and Bl₁₉ have doubts about *e*.

B17 C *su*, SfTmSw *sū*

B17 C *sagaṃsirvaṃrabadiññ*, Sf *sagusivaṃrabadiññ*, TmSw *sagaṃsivaṃrabadiññ*

B17 TmSwC *sagha*, Sf *s(e)gha*

B17 C *hña*, TmSw *hX*; TmSw *X* represents a non-Burmese character which does not match the Pyu eyecopy. In Tm's glossary, this akṣara is transliterated in Burmese as *hna*.

B18 C *dum*, Tm *dūm*, Sw *dū*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his Burmese transliteration.

B18 C *tdum*, TmSw *tdūm*

B19 TmSwC *se*; Kr *so*

B20 SwC *stau*, Tm *sto*

B20 C *hḍī*, Tm *hḷo*, Sw *hḷau*

B20 C *ma*, TmSw omit

B20 C *samanarḍomñḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ *samanaḷōḥ*, Sf *samanalōḥ*, TmSw *samanaḷauṃ*

B21 C *jimvuḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ *jimvūḥ* or *jihvūḥ*, Tm *himbūḥ*, Kr *jimvavḥ*, Sw *tibūḥ*

B23 C *tdum*, TmSw *tdūm*

B23 SwC *diññ*, Tm *diñ*; Tm has *ñ* in his eyecopy but not his Burmese transliteration.

B23 C *ḥuḥ*, Tm *bū*, Sw *būḥ*; Tm has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his Burmese transliteration.

B24 C *saveñudeña*, Sf *..veñodeñe*, TmSw *saveññodeññe*; Sf could not read the first akṣara.

B24 C *b(r)e[ña]*, TmSw *breññe*, Kr *bre*; Kr could not read the second akṣara.

B24 TmSwC *(ḥ)i(mḥ ḥ)i(mḥ pañḥ) ch(e) naḥ*; Kr could not read these akṣaras.

B24 C *pḍa(m)ḥ*, TmSw *pḷamḥ*

B24 C *(//)*, TmSw *(yam)*

B25 C *ya(m)*, TmSw omit; Kr could not read this akṣara.
 B25 C *[t]r[a]*, TmSw *trah*; Kr could not read this akṣara.
 B25 TmSwC *[sa]ḥ*; Kr could not read this akṣara.
 B25 C *pḍi*, Tm *pli*, Sw *pḷi*
 B25 C *(s)ruḥ*, Tm *[srū]*, Kr *srūḥ* or *sruḥ*, Sw *(srūḥ)*
 B26 C *ju*, TmSw *ja*
 B26 C *[h]ñu*, TmSw *na*, Kr regards this akṣara as "destroyed".
 B27 C *hñim*, TmSw *hññim*
 B27 C *ci*, SfTmSw *chi*
 B27 SfC *pdam*, Tm *pḍam*, Sw *pḷam*
 B27 C *ñuḥ*, SfTm *ñūḥ*, Sw *vūḥ*
 B28 C *kdiṃ*, SfTmSw *diṃ*; Sf sees *kdiṃ* but thinks preinitial *k* is unlikely.
 B28 C *kchimḥ*, Sf *chimḥ*, TmSw *chi*; Sf sees *kchimḥ* but thinks preinitial *k* is unlikely.
 B28 C *tmu*, SfTmSw *tmū*
 B29 TmSwC || @, Bl₁₁ || followed by "some more punctuation marks to indicate the end of the text", Bl₁₉ ||, Kr *ra ra @*

References

- Bob Hudson. Marc Miyake. Arlo Griffiths and Julian Wheatley. Studies in pyu epigraphy and pyu language, i: state of the field, edition and analysis of the kan wet khaung gon inscription, and inventory of the corpus. *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient*, 2017.
- Michael Aung-Thwin. *The Mists of Rāmañña: the legend that was lower Burma*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, 2005.
- Christian Bauer. Numismatics, dialectology, and the periodization of old mon. *Mon-Khmer Studies*, 16-17:155–176., 1990.
- Christopher I. Beckwith. *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages: proceedings of the 9th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000*, chapter A glossary of Pyu, pages 159–161. Brill's Tibetan studies library. Brill, Leiden, 2002.
- Louis de Beylié. *Prome et Samara: voyage archéologique en Birmanie et en Mésopotamie*. Publications de la Société française des fouilles archéologiques. Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1907.
- C. O. Blagden. The talaing inscription of the myazedi pagoda at pagan, with a few remarks on the other versions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 1017–1052, 1909.
- C. O. Blagden. Two corrected readings in the myazedi (talaing) inscription. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 486–487, April 1912.
- C. O. Blagden. The myazedi inscriptions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 1063–1069, October 1914.
- C. O. Blagden. The "pyu" inscriptions. *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, 7(1):37–44, 1917.

- C.O. Blagden. A further note on the inscriptions of the myazedi pagoda, pagan, and other inscriptions throwing light on them. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 797–812, 1910a.
- C.O. Blagden. The early use of the buddhist era in burma. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 850–856, 1910b.
- C.O. Blagden. A preliminary study of the fourth text of the myazedi inscriptions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 365–388, 1911.
- C.O. Blagden. The mon or talaing face of the myazedi inscription at pagan. *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1):53–58, 1919a.
- C.O. Blagden. The pyu face of the myazedi inscription at pagan. *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1):59–68, 1919b.
- C.O. Blagden and J.F. Fleet. The revised buddhist era in burma. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 474–481, 1910.
- George Coëdès. Review of c.o. blagden: "a preliminary study of the fourth text of the myazedi inscriptions". *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient*, 11(1):435–436, 1911.
- Charles Duroiselle. The burmese face of the myazedi inscription at pagan. *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1):1–46, 1919a.
- CharlesE Duroiselle. (transliteration of the pali face of the myazedi). *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1):47–52, 1919b.
- Emil Forchhammer. *Inscriptions of Pagan, Pinya and Ava, deciphered from the ink impressions found among the papers of the late Dr. E. Forchhammer*. The Superintendent, Government Printing, Rangoon, 1892.
- Arlo Griffiths, Marc Miyake, , and Julian K. Wheatley. Corpus of pyu inscriptions, 2018. URL <http://hisoma.huma-num.fr/exist/apps/pyu/index2.html>. Accessed June 2018.
- Matthias Jenny. The far west of southeast asia: 'give' and 'get' in the languages of myanmar. In N.J. Enfield and Bernard Comrie, editors, *Languages of mainland Southeast Asia: the state of the art*, Pacific Linguistics 649, pages 155–208. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 2015.
- Atsuhiko Kato. Pyū-go to karen-kei shogengo no ruijisei, 2005. URL http://www.sfs.osaka-u.ac.jp/user/burmese/Pyu_Karen.pdf.
- Uwe Krech. *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages*, volume 4 of *Brill's Tibetan studies library*, chapter A preliminary reassessment of the Pyu faces of the Myazedi inscriptions at Pagan, pages 121–169. Brill, Leiden, 2012.
- G.H. Luce. Myinkaba kubyauk-gyi temple of rājakumār (1113 a.d.), and the old mon writings on its walls. *Bulletin of the Burma Historical Commission*, 2:277–416, 1961.
- G.H. Luce and Ba Shin. *Old Burma—early Pagán*. Number 25 in *Artibus Asiae, Supplementum*. Published for Artibus Asiae and the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University [by] J.J. Augustin, Locust Valley, N.Y., 1969-1970.

- Tatsuo Nishida. Myazedi hibun ni okeru chūko biruma-go no kenkyū (studies in the ancient burmese language through the myazedi inscriptions) (1). *Palaeologia*, IV(1):17–32, March 1955.
- Tatsuo Nishida. Myazedi hibun ni okeru chūko biruma-go no kenkyū (studies in the ancient burmese language through the myazedi inscriptions) (2). *Palaeologia*, V(1):22–40, March 1956.
- Tun Nyein. *Inscriptions of Pagan, Pinya and Ava: translation with notes*. The Superintendent, Government Printing, Rangoon, 1899.
- Robert Shafer. Further analysis of the pyu inscriptions. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 7(4): 313–366, 1943.
- Janice Stargardt. *The ancient Pyu of Burma, vol. 1: Early Pyu cities in a man-made landscape*. PACSEA in association with the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, Cambridge, 1990.
- U Tha Myat. *Mracetī pyū krokcā*. Pr. Democracy Publishing, Rangoon, 1958.
- U Tha Myat. *Pyu reader*. U Hla Din, Rangoon, 1963.
- Than Tun. *A course on Pyu inscriptions*. Burma Historical Commission, Rangoon, 1958.
- Shirō Yabu. *Old Burmese (OB) of Myazedi inscription in OB materials*. Osaka University of Foreign Studies, Osaka, 2006.